

Copyright
by
Anna V. Andriasova
2006

**The Dissertation Committee for Anna Valerii Andriasova Certifies that this is the
approved version of the following dissertation:**

**They Placed, I Saw, I Was Conquered:
Evaluating the Effects of Persuasion Knowledge
and Prominence of Brand Placement
on Viewers' Attitudes and Behavior**

Committee:

Isabella C. Cunningham, Supervisor

Susan N. Beretvas

Sejung M. Choi

Terry Daugherty

Linda L. Golden

**They Placed, I Saw, I Was Conquered:
Evaluating the Effects of Persuasion Knowledge
and Prominence of Brand Placement
on Viewers' Attitudes and Behavior**

by

Anna Valerii Andriasova, BA, MBA

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

December, 2006

Dedication

To my family, whose sacrifices and support enabled me to come this far

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my Supervisor, Dr. Isabella Cunningham, for her steadfast guidance, her enormous patience and the vast knowledge she imparted to me over the course of the preparation of this research. She has been a fount of wisdom and a rock of reassurance throughout. I would also like to thank all the other members of my Committee – Drs. Golden, Beretvas, Choi and Daugherty – for their encouragement and support. Without their help and facilitation, this work would not have been possible. I would also like to acknowledge Dr. Carson Wagner, whose suggestions and comments on the studies that make up this project were invaluable.

Besides these excellent academicians who guided my progress, there are many other individuals, both at UT and outside it, who helped me reach this goal. While too numerous to mention by name, I would like to thank these wonderful people for all the efforts they expended on my behalf.

**They Placed, I Saw, I Was Conquered:
Evaluating the Effects of Persuasion Knowledge
and Prominence of Brand Placement
on Viewers' Attitudes and Behavior**

Publication No. _____

Anna Valerii Andriasova, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2006

Supervisor: Isabella C. Cunningham

With the diminishing value of traditional television advertising – due to fragmented television audiences and the development of commercial skipping technologies such as TiVo – advertisers are looking at ways to integrate brands directly into mass media programming.

This phenomenon has come to be known as brand placement, and this study examines the influence of such placements on viewers' brand-related memory, attitude and behavior. The study proposes that viewers' attitude towards the programming content, their desire to emulate the character associated with the placement, their awareness of the persuasive intent of brand placement, and the prominence of the

placement itself - impact that influence. The study also proposes that low-involvement implicit measures may be more effective than traditional self-reported measures in uncovering the full effects of brand placement.

Those proposals formed the basis of a three-study experimental research project. The first study evaluated the use of implicit measures, such as Strength-of-Association (SOA), in brand placement research. The second study evaluated how knowledge of the persuasive intent of brand placement affects viewers' brand-related memory, attitudes and behavior. The third study evaluated whether the effects of brand placement differ, depending on the placement prominence among viewers with knowledge of persuasion intent.

The initial investigation shows that though self-reported brand attitudes did not differ among the viewers exposed to brand placement and those who were not, their brand-related SOAs reflected significant differences. Further results reveal that memory effects are strongest when viewers are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement. With regards to SOAs, when viewers are not aware of persuasion intent, their attitude towards the programming and desire to emulate the characters may be used to predict their brand-related SOAs. Such SOAs are also affected by the prominence of the placement. In terms of behavior effects, viewers with no knowledge of persuasive intent were more likely to choose a prominently placed brand over competitors' brands, whereas viewers with such knowledge were more likely to choose subtly placed brands.

This study concludes with a discussion of the theoretical and managerial contributions of the findings above, and suggestions for possible extensions of the research conducted.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	xiii
List of Figures	xv
Chapter 1: Brand Placement as a Communication Tool	1
1.1 History of Product Placement	2
1.2 Definition of Product Placement as a Marketing Communication Tool..	5
1.2.1 Brand Placement vs. Product Placement	7
1.3 Factors Facilitating the Development of Brand Placement	10
1.3.1 Diminishing Value of Traditional Television Advertising	10
1.3.2 TiVo and Other Similar Technology	11
1.3.3 Increased Number of Reality Shows and Situational Comedies	12
1.3.4 Long-Term Cooperation Among Networks and Marketers	13
1.3.5 Virtual Product Placements.....	14
1.4 Benefits and Drawbacks of Brand Placement.....	15
1.4.1 Benefits of Brand Placement for Studios or Moviemakers	17
1.4.2 Drawbacks of Brand Placements	18
1.5 Legal and Social Aspects of Brand Placement	19
1.5.1 Legal Issues Surrounding Brand Placement	19
1.5.2 Previous Regulatory Efforts Affecting Brand Placement.....	20
1.5.3 The Ethical and Social Aspects of Brand Placement.....	21
1.6 Chapter Summary	22
Chapter 2: Research on Brand Placement Effectiveness – What Do We	
Know About Brand Placement?	24
2.1 Potential Effects of Brand Placement	24
2.2 Differences in Brand Placement in Terms of Exposure, Mode and	
Time	25
2.3 Brand Placement and the Media	29
2.3.1 Brand Placement in Movies	29

2.3.2 Brand Placement on Television	30
2.3.3 Brand Placement in Video and Computer Games	31
2.3.4 Brand Placement in Music Videos, Song Lyrics and Books	34
2.3.5 Brand Placement Online	35
2.4 Brand Placement Effectiveness Measures	36
2.4.1 Memory	37
2.4.2 Attitude Towards the Brand	39
2.4.3 Purchase Intention and Viewers' Choice of Brand	40
2.4.4 Attitude Towards Brand Placements	43
2.5 Standards for Comparing Brand Placement Effectiveness	47
2.6 Other Factors in the Measurement of Brand Placement Effectiveness	53
2.7 Chapter Summary	54
Chapter 3: Theoretical Foundations of Brand Placement	56
3.1 Existing Models of How Brand Placement Works	56
3.2 Other Models and Theories Applied to Brand Placement	59
3.2.1 Elaboration Likelihood Model	59
3.2.2 MODE Model and Implicit Attitudes	62
3.2.3 Low Involvement Learning	64
3.2.4 Presence	64
3.2.5 Mere Exposure Effect	66
3.3 Additional Possible Model for Explaining Brand Placement Effectiveness	67
3.3.1 Persuasion Knowledge Model	68
3.4 Proposed Framework for How Brand Placement Works	70
3.5 Chapter Summary	71
Chapter 4: Overview of the Research Study and Research Propositions	73
4.1 General Purpose of the Research	73
4.2. General Propositions of the Research	73
4.3. Theoretical Explanations of Using Traditional (Explicit) and Implicit Measures for brand placement research	78
4.4 Description of the Multi-Study Research Project	81
4.5 Hypotheses Development for the Multi-study Research Project	85

4.5.1 Study 1 – Testing Implicit Measures for Brand Placement Research	85
4.5.2 Study 2 – Examining if Viewers’ Knowledge of Persuasion Intent of Brand Placement Affects Their Attitude and Behavior	91
4.5.3 Study 3 - Evaluating the Effects of Persuasion Knowledge and Prominence of Brand Placement on Viewers’ Attitudes and Behavior Related to the Placed Brand	100
Chapter 5: Methodology of the Research Study	104
5.1 Overall Sample Description	104
5.1.1 Sample Description for Study 1	105
5.1.2 Sample Description for Study 2	105
5.1.3 Sample Description for Study 3	106
5.2. Research Stimuli	106
5.2.1. Stimuli for Study 1 and Study 2	106
5.2.2 Stimulus for Study 3	107
5.3 Procedure	108
5.3.1 Description of Research Procedures for Study 1	108
5.3.2 Description of Research Procedures for Study 2	108
5.3.3 Description of Research Procedures for Study 3	110
5.4 Dependent Measures	111
5.4.1 Brand Placements and Strength of Association (SOA)	111
5.4.1.1 SOA Measure for Study 1 and Study 2	112
5.4.1.2 SOA measure for Study 3	113
5.4.2 Brand Placement and Attitude Towards the Brand	114
5.4.3 Brand Placement and Implicit Choice Test	115
5.4.3.1 Choice Measure for Study 2	116
5.4.3.2 Choice Measure for Study 3	116
5.4.4 Memory Measures	117
5.4.4.1 Recall	117
5.4.4.2 Recognition	118
5.4.5 Other Measures	118
5.5 Data Analysis	119

Chapter 6: Findings of the Research Study.....	120
6.1 Study 1 – Testing Implicit Measures for Brand Placement Research ..	120
6.1.1 SOA and Self-Reported Attitudes Towards the Brand	120
6.1.2 Placement-Associated Character and Self-Reported Brand Attitude Index	121
6.1.3 Placement-Associated Character and SOA.....	122
6.1.4 Involvement with the Program and Self-Reported Brand Attitude Index	123
6.1.5 Involvement With the Program and SOA	124
6.2 Study 2 – Examining the Effect of Viewers’ Knowledge of Persuasion Intent of Brand Placement on Their Attitude and Behavior	126
6.2.1 Effects of Brand Placement on Viewers’ Memory	126
6.2.2 Effects of Viewers’ Persuasion Knowledge of Brand Placement on Brand-related Strength of Association.....	131
6.2.3 Effects of Viewers’ Persuasion Knowledge of Brand Placement on Attitude Towards the Brand.....	132
6.2.4 Influence of the Show and Characters Associated With the Placement on Self-Reported Brand Attitudes	133
6.2.5 Influence of the Show and Characters Associated With the Placement on SOA	136
6.2.6 Behavior Test - Choice	139
6.2.7 Behavior Test - Buying Intentions	141
6.3 Study 3 – Examining the Effects of Persuasion Knowledge and Prominence of Brand Placement on Viewers’ Attitudes and Behavior Related to the Placed Brand	144
6.3.1 Effects of Brand Placement on Viewers’ Unaided Recall of the Placed Brand	144
6.3.2 Effects of Brand Placement on Viewers’ Recognition of the Placed Brand.....	146
6.3.3 Effects of Viewers’ Persuasion Knowledge and Prominence of Brand Placement on Brand-Related Strength of Association	148
6.3.4 Effects of Viewers’ Persuasion Knowledge and Prominence of Brand Placement on Viewers’ Self-Reported Brand Attitudes	150
6.3.5 Behavior Test - Choice and Buying Intentions.....	152

Chapter 7: Discussion of the Results of the Three Studies, Conclusions and Contributions	157
7.1 Discussion of the Results of Study 1	157
7.2 Discussion of the Results of Study 2	159
7.3 Discussion of the Results of Study 3	163
7.4. Contributions of This Research Project	165
7.4.1 Theoretical Contributions	165
7.4.2 Practical Contributions.....	167
7.5 Limitations of This Research	169
7.6 Extensions of This Research.....	171
7.6.1 Methodological Extensions.....	171
7.6.2 Content Extensions	172
Appendix A Sample Description	176
Appendix B Description of Stimuli	179
Appendix C Sample of Informed Consent Form Signed by Research Participants	184
Appendix D Copy of Priming Statements Used in Study 2 & 3.....	188
Appendix E Description and Copy of Strength of Association Measures.....	191
Appendix F Copy of the Main Research Questionnaire	213
Appendix G Debriefing Procedure and Debriefing Note	222
References.....	223
Vita	236

List of Tables

Table 1:	Viewers' Brand-Related SOAs and Self-Reported Brand Attitudes for Control and Experimental Groups.....	121
Table 2:	Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Viewers' Brand Related SOAs.....	124
Table 3:	Summary of Cross-Tabulation Analysis of Unaided Recall of the Placed Brand in Control and Experimental groups	127
Table 4:	Summary of Cross-Tabulation Analysis of Recognition of the Placed Brand in Control and Experimental groups	129
Table 5:	Summary of Cross-Tabulation Results of Recognition of Brand Placement Details in Control and Experimental groups.....	130
Table 6:	Analysis of Variance for Viewers' Brand Related SOA Scores.....	131
Table 7:	Dunnet's Post-hoc Tests for Multiple Comparisons of SOA Scores in Control and Experimental groups	132
Table 8:	Analysis of Variance for Viewers' Self-Reported Brand Attitudes	133
Table 9:	Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Viewers' Self-Reported Brand Attitudes in Low Persuasion Knowledge Group	134
Table 10:	Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Viewers' Self-Reported Brand Attitudes in High Persuasion Knowledge Positive Group	135
Table 11:	Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Viewers' Self-Reported Brand Attitudes in High Persuasion Knowledge Negative Group.....	135
Table 12:	Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Viewers' Brand Related SOAs in Low Persuasion Knowledge Group	136
Table 13:	Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Viewers' Brand Related SOAs in High Persuasion Knowledge Positive Group	137
Table 14:	Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Viewers' brand related SOAs in High Persuasion Knowledge Negative Group	137

Table 15:	Summary of Regression Analysis for Character Related Variables, Predicting Viewers' Brand Related SOAs in Low Persuasion Knowledge Group.....	138
Table 16:	Summary of Regression Analysis for Character Related Variables, Predicting Viewers' Brand Related SOAs in High Persuasion Knowledge Positive Group.....	139
Table 17:	Summary of Regression Analysis for Character Related Variables, Predicting Viewers' Brand Related SOAs in High Persuasion Knowledge Negative Group	139
Table 18:	Summary of Results of Cross-Tabulation Analysis of Viewers' Choice of the Placed Brand in Control and Experimental groups ..	140
Table 19:	Analysis of Variance for Viewers' Self-Reported Buying Intentions in Control and Experimental Groups	141
Table 20:	Summary of Cross-Tabulation Analysis of Unaided Recall of the Placed Brand in Experimental Groups.....	145
Table 21:	Summary of Cross-Tabulation Analysis of Recognition of the Placed Brand in Experimental Groups.....	147
Table 22:	Summary of Cross-Tabulation Analysis of Recognition of Brand Placement Details in Experimental Groups	148
Table 23:	Analysis of Variance for Brand Related SOA Scores and Set of Orthogonal Comparisons Among Control and Experimental groups.....	150
Table 24:	Analysis of Variance for Viewers' Self-Reported Brand Attitudes and set of Orthogonal Comparisons Among Control and Experimental Groups	151
Table 25:	Summary of Cross-Tabulation Analysis of Viewers' Choice of Prominently Placed Brand in Low and High Persuasion Knowledge Group.....	153
Table 26:	Summary of Cross-Tabulation Analysis of Viewers' Choice of the Subtly Placed brand in Low and High Persuasion Knowledge Groups.....	154

List of Figures

Figure 1:	Design of Study 1.....	82
Figure 2:	Design of Study 2.....	83
Figure 3:	Design of Study 3.....	85
Figure 4:	Hypotheses Tested in Study 1 and Summary of Results	125
Figure 5:	Hypotheses Tested in Study 2 and Summary of Results	142
Figure 6:	Hypotheses Tested in Study 3 and Summary of Results	155

Chapter 1: *Brand Placement as a Communication Tool*

"If you don't get noticed, you don't have anything. You just have to be noticed, but the art is in getting noticed naturally, without screaming or without tricks."

Leo Burnett

The concept of “getting your product noticed naturally” is not a new one – it has been very well developed by advertisers in recent years. We have seen many ads where the product “enters” the story naturally and unobtrusively, making us, the consumers, enjoy the setting and the story. Most successful ads are examples of this technique. However, the most reflective implementation of this strategy, expressed by Leo Burnett – one of the biggest advertising geniuses of the 20th century, is exhibited in the “product placement” techniques used by advertisers.

Product placement, defined as the paid inclusion of branded products or brand identifiers within mass media programming (Karrh, 1998), has increased in popularity in recent years and attracted special attention from advertisers. Challenged by the increasing costs of television advertising (Steinberg & Vranica, 2003a), the increased clutter of commercial messages (Downey, 2002), and technological advances like TiVo that enable consumers to eliminate ads, advertisers are looking for alternative ways to reach their audience, in addition to television advertising (Ebenkamp, 2001). Creative inclusion of brands in the content of the television programming costs less than television advertising on average, helps advertisers make a brand stand out from the clutter of

advertising messages during commercial breaks, and overcomes ad skipping technologies.

1.1 HISTORY OF PRODUCT PLACEMENT

Though product placement has received an amplified interest during the last decade, the practice of insertion of brands in the content of movies or television programming is not a novel one. Recently, traces of brand inclusion were found in the very early films of the Lumière brothers. One of their first, a less than 100-second long film from 1896 named “Washing Day in Switzerland,” prominently displayed a case of “Sunlight” soap next to women doing laundry in the film (Newell & Salmon, 2003). The explanation of such blatant placement was rather trivial – the agent for the Lumière brothers was also the distributor and promoter of the soap manufacturer. But this instance gave rise to the technique that 100 years later would be called product placement.

Only a year after the “Sunlight” placement, Thomas Edison started to use product placement as a technique for the reduction of out of pocket expenses for movie makers (Newell & Salmon, 2003). Most of his fifty-two films featuring train arrivals and departures were subsidized by railroad companies. Though some of his placements were rather overt, the majority of them were really subtle; however they clearly showed the company’s name on the screen.

With the growth of the movie industry, producers have tried to get more than just a reduction of production costs with brand inclusions. Starting in the 1920s, cooperative promotional agreements between moviemakers and manufacturers led to advertising and promotional support for films by manufacturers, in exchange for on-screen product

appearances and/or star endorsements. This arrangement was beneficial for both parties, since enhanced advertising and promotion increased ticket sales for motion pictures, while providing marketers with screen exposure and associations with celebrities for their products (Barry & Sargeant, 1927).

Thus, though the term product placement did not come into common use until the mid 1980s (Newell & Salmon, 2003), the technique itself started to develop from the 1920s under various names – “tie-ups”, “tie-in advertising” or “exploitations.” By the beginning of the 1930s, tie-ups were a common industry practice, where products were made available for moviemakers for on-screen use free of charge, in exchange for a promotional mention in the manufacturer’s PR campaign. For example, the MGM movie “Dinner at 8” (1934) was promoted at thousands of Coca-Cola outlets with posters that featured cast members drinking Coca-Cola; the soft drink was also displayed in the movie. The development of this brand promotion technique continued as tie-ups were taken to a retail level, where presentation of new merchandise would coincide with the opening of the film where that brand was placed.

During the 1950s and 60s, tie-ups were very common in the movie industry; the reciprocal promotion of the movie and the merchandise featured in it was regarded as an effective cost-reduction method. This practice also helped to increase realism in the new breed of independent films that were created after the collapse of the studio system (Elliot, 1997).

The expansion of the industry brought the need for a specialized profession – exploitation agents that were part of advertising and public relation agencies. They would match brands available for placement with producers of films. Special warehouses stored

brand name products ready to use on stage on the first call of the movie producers. Some manufacturers went further than just supplying the products to studios; Anheuser-Busch developed a line of historical beer cans for use in period pictures (Newell & Salmon, 2003).

Though product placement continued to be a rather common practice, it did not attract any special attention from advertisers and brand specialists until the release of the movie “E.T. The Extra-Terrestrial” in 1982, where a little alien follows a trail of Hershey’s Reese’s Pieces. Hershey’s Inc. agreed to spend \$1 million dollars on E.T. and Reese’s Pieces promotion. This placement is cited as the turning point in the development of product placement practice and is one its most successful examples, tripling the sales of the placed “Reese’s Pieces” brand (Van Biema, 1982). It was followed by many other famous placements – Pepsi-Cola in “Back to the Future” (1989), Red Stripe Beer in “The Firm” (1993), Ray-Ban glasses “Risky Business” (1983) and “Men in Black” (1997) and many others.

As the development of the product placement industry shows, a brand’s appearance in a form of mass programming served a dual purpose: brands were used as a strategic tool for producers to increase the realism of the program by including real brands when the script called for product usage; and as promotional tools for manufacturers and producers. In exchange for the latter, advertiser either paid the studios in cash, engaged in barter, or conducted tied promotions (Karrh, 1998).

Nowadays, the use of brand placement as a promotional tool can be achieved by several types of arrangements. In exchange for exposure in a movie or television programming, manufacturers can provide free products, pay a straight product placement

fee, or allocate part of their marketing budget to support the promotion of the movie (Mortimer, 2002). While all these methods have been used in the past, modern studios prefer the supporting promotion arrangement. With increased competition, opening weekend sales and first week ratings are crucial for the overall success of a movie or program, which makes reaching wider audience with their promotion extremely important (Sreenivasan, 1997). For example, BMW reportedly invested twenty million dollars of their joint promotional campaign to back the placement of the Z3 model as James Bond's vehicle in "Golden Eye" (Karrh, 1998); likewise, Apple spent fifteen million dollars on promoting the movie "Mission: Impossible" where Tom Cruise's character is using Apple computers throughout his adventures (Caro, 1996).

The wide recognition and use of this technique by advertisers made researchers and agencies look closely into the characteristics of product placement – its specific benefits compared to those of other well developed techniques of marketing communication. The following section defines the practice of product placement and presents an overview of the benefits that stem from the essence of this method.

1.2 DEFINITION OF PRODUCT PLACEMENT AS A MARKETING COMMUNICATION TOOL

After the spike of interest towards product placement in the mid 1990s, several definitions were offered in the literature. One of the early ones, proposed by Balasubramanian (1994), defined product placement as "a paid product message aimed at influencing movie or television audience via the planned and unobtrusive entry of branded product into a movie or television program." Several later definitions expanded

the original one to the whole range of mass media and to various forms of compensation provided by advertisers. They described product placement as the “inclusion of branded products or services (or brand identifiers), for some consideration on the part of the brand’s sponsor, within the content of mass media programming” – McKee (1998); or the “practice that involves incorporating brands in movies (also in TV and radio programming, music videos, novels, plays and songs) in return for money or for some promotional or other consideration” – Gupta and Gould (1997).

The following description adds the nature of the placement to the previous definitions – Karrh (1998) characterized product placement as the “paid inclusion of branded products or brand identifiers, through audio or visual means, within mass media programming.” Recently, product placement was broadly defined as the “practice of placing branded products in the content of mass programming” (Russel, 2002).

Though each of the above definitions points out important aspects of product placement, they also omit other main components. Balasubramanian’s definition correctly captures the nature of product placement being unobtrusive (Croft, 2001) and its purpose being to influence the audience. None of the succeeding definitions included that. However, it fails to recognize other possible ways for advertiser to compensate the studio or program producer, like joint marketing campaigns, or advertising the programming content on some branded products. It also limits product placement practice to movies and television. Subsequent definitions by McKee (1997) and Gupta and Lord (1997) state the multiplicity of media available for product placement, and acknowledge the possibility of other ways of compensation for product placement by advertisers. However, these definitions fail to state the purpose and unobtrusive character of the

product placement messages. Karrh's definition has been one of the most accepted in the recent literature; yet, like the first Balasubramanian's definition, it does not account for other non-paid forms of compensation for product placement. The most recent definition by Russel is very broad and includes cases when the producer of the program shows the brand without any agreement and/or no compensation from the advertiser.

1.2.1 Brand Placement vs. Product Placement

Historically, the terms brand placement and product placement have been used interchangeably in the press and academic publications. However, these terms can refer to two completely separate concepts. Brand placement refers to a placement of a certain brand of product (for example, a character riding a Harley Davidson motorcycle), whereas product placement is a placement of a general product category (for example, a character riding a motorcycle, as opposed to a car). It is usually specific brands or brand identifiers, rather than types of products, that are being placed in the content of the programming. At least one attempt has been made to clarify this distinction (Karrh, 1998). Though trade publications are mostly using product placement to describe the practice of brand inclusion in mass programming, in academic publications there are three different nomenclatures – authors that refer to the practice as “brand placement” (for example, DeLorme & Reid, 1999; Nelson, 2002), authors that use “product placement” (for example, Gupta & Gould, 1997; Morton & Friedman, 2002) and authors that use both terms interchangeably (for example, McKee, 1997; Babin & Carder, 1996).

Taking into account the above-mentioned comments, the proposed revised definition of the practice of brand insertions in mass media programming used for this research is the following:

Brand placement is a method of marketing communication that includes the unobtrusive insertion of a brand or any brand identifier in the content of mass media programming, in return for monetary or other consideration, with the purpose of influencing the audience.

An analysis of this definition reveals the importance of each component in characterizing the practice of brand placement and distinguishing it from other methods of marketing communications. Breaking it down into its components, the above definition becomes: “Brand placement is (1) a method of marketing communication that includes the (2) unobtrusive insertion of (3) a brand or any brand identifier in the content of (4) mass media programming, in return for (5) monetary or other consideration, with the purpose of (6) influencing the audience.

(1) Brand placement is now a widely accepted method of marketing communication (Steinberg & Vranica, 2003a). Entertainment Resources and Marketing Association (currently Entertainment Marketing Association), founded in 1991 with the purpose of bringing together corporations and agencies that are interested in providing entertainment resources to the film and television community (ERMA website, 2004) – signifies the first attempt to unify the practice of product placement. In addition to this official association, a group of major advertisers recommended recognizing product placement as a new medium of communication between producers and consumers in 1992 (Elliot, 1992b).

(2) The unobtrusive nature of the placements is extremely important. The main idea of brand placement is making the brand a part of the program, carefully weaving it into the content or the setting of the scene. Industry experts agree that the best brand placements are “seamless... and present a realistic picture of life as we have lived it, but not to the point of intruding into the dramatic content of the film” (Croft, 2001). However, some of the recent placements in television shows and movies are very blatant and obvious, making the brand the center of the programming with all the action focused around it (Gordon, 2003).

(3) Brand placement involves not only placement of the branded products, but also any other audio or visual brand identifier, such as brand jingles or logos. Brand placements can range from a whole scene in the movie or TV show where the brand is being discussed (like the Pottery Barn placement in a “Friends” episode), to just a short visual placement of the brand logo on the background scene (like Krispy Crème Donuts in an episode of “Will and Grace”), to anything in between.

(4) Brand placement is not limited to movies and television. Though these are still the most widely used mass media vehicles for brand placements (Avery & Ferrano, 2000), more and more brand placements are appearing in music videos, video games and even books (Karrh, 1998). Recently, instances of brand placements were found on radio programs (Friedman, 2005) and in magazines (Lareau, 2005)

(5) The compensations made by advertisers in exchange for brand exposure are not limited to monetary transactions. In fact, most brand placements do not involve direct payment (Loro, 1990). Some of the companies just provide free branded products for the program production; others support the marketing efforts of the production studio by

advertising the upcoming movie or other mass media programming with their brand, or by creating a joint promotion campaign (Mortimer, 2002).

(6) Brand placements are intended to affect consumer behavior by influencing their attitudes towards – and recall and recognition of – the brands being placed (Karrh, 1998).

The next section presents the factors facilitating the development of brand placement, followed by the benefits and drawbacks of this technique for marketers and studios.

1.3 FACTORS FACILITATING THE DEVELOPMENT OF BRAND PLACEMENT

1.3.1 Diminishing Value of Traditional Television Advertising

Television advertising has been a leading marketing communication medium for a long time. Unique creative abilities coupled with mass coverage have made television a first choice medium for many advertisers for several decades.

However, recently advertisers and researchers have questioned the popularity and further growth of traditional television advertisings (Arnold, 2004; Avery & Ferrano, 2000). Increased costs of television advertising, coupled with ever-growing advertising clutter on TV, eventually diminish the overall value that advertisers are getting out of their thirty-second commercials. First, the cost of television commercials is constantly increasing, with almost double-digit increases for the prime-time programming slots recorded over the last few years (Steinberg & Vranica, 2003). Second, according to the American Association of Advertising Agencies, growing advertising clutter is among the

biggest issues advertisers are facing today (Downey, 2002). On average, the amount of non-program content on major networks accounts for seventeen minutes per hour. Increased number of messages per commercial break means that each ad becomes less effective in drawing the viewer's attention. The increased number of commercials decreases the ability of consumers to recall and process the ads, therefore diminishing the effect and value of commercials for advertisers. According to a study done by Nielsen Media Research, a viewer's ability to recall an ad goes down by about 45% in commercial breaks with seven and more spots compared to breaks with three or four spots (Downey, 2002). Increased clutter also makes viewers engage in more channel surfing (McClellan, 2003; Grimm, 2001), which in itself is a big setback for advertisers, because during channel surfing consumers usually skip any commercials they encounter.

Channel surfing has become more of an issue with the development of cable television, which can make available more than five hundred channels to audiences. This makes it difficult for marketers to reach the once coveted "prime-time" audience with a single advertising message, aired at a particular time (Freeman, 1991).

1.3.2 TiVo and Other Similar Technology

In addition to costs, clutter and audience fragmentation, many technological advances are allowing viewers to totally eliminate advertising content from the programming. Advanced video and DVD recorders – such as TiVo, Personal Video Recorders (PVR) – are equipped to skip commercial messages while recording the program or provide other ways to minimize a viewer's exposure to persuasive messages. According to the Multichannel News Consumer Poll, 24% of viewers are willing to use

this type of technology in their home; another 15% are using it regularly. Brand placement offers advertisers a unique opportunity to overcome such devices (Steinberg & Vranica, 2003), because the brand message does not stand alone, but is incorporated in the content of the program.

1.3.3 Increased Number of Reality Shows and Situational Comedies

According to an Opinion Research Corporation study in 2002, there is just one category of television programming that enjoys equally high attention among adults and teenagers – the situation comedy (sitcom). Sitcoms are on the top-three watched types of programs for both of these groups – 14% of adults and 20% of teenagers watch television sitcoms. Such high preference among the viewers is not new for sitcoms; they've enjoyed high popularity throughout their history. Various content analyses of prime-time television agree on the fact that situation comedies are consistently the most popular prime time type of program (Comstock, Chaffee, Katzman, McCombs & Roberts, 1978).

Initially, the most valuable scripted prime-time sitcoms and dramas had been considered off-limits for brand placements and producers were often using generic products (Bauder, 1999; Steinberg & Vranica, 2003 a,b). This trend has changed recently and brands are making their leap into the popular television sitcoms and shows. With sitcoms being among the most viewed television programs (Research Alert, 2002), they present a very desirable target for advertisers.

With many brands placing their products in the popular sitcoms in recent years, famous success stories have developed. Some of the sitcoms even have episodes named after products, like the famous “Junior Mint” episode of *Seinfeld*. Ramada Inn can also

serve as an example of successful brand placement in one of the best sitcoms, *The Drew Carey Show*, where Drew's band plays exclusively at Ramada. Advertisers are viewing brand placement in the shows as a very cost effective way to complement traditional advertising. According to them, they are not only getting visibility for the brand, but also an entertainment profile compatible with their marketing objectives. They also think that brand names placed in popular sitcoms bring instant association with the leading actors (Nozar, 2001).

In addition to traditional situational comedies, the new genre of reality television is growing. As this new genre is developing, producers have realized that brand placements could serve as catalysts of reality and as a significant source of income for a specific show. Ikea stores and United Airlines in "Amazing Race", Levi's in "Apprentice", Chevrolet in "Survivor – All Stars" are just a few examples of how advertisers can become part of the reality show ("Ten Most-Recalled Product Placements in Reality Shows," 2004).

1.3.4 Long-Term Cooperation Among Networks and Marketers

Facing a demand for increased profitability, networks are looking for additional financial inflows and are turning to marketers to find them. One example is the UPN network – they have continuously provided value-added services like brand placement to advertisers such as Heineken and General Motors for the past several years, not only limited to featuring these brands in television shows they air, but also running various promotional activities like giving away a brand of General Motors vehicle (Valenti, 2001). Television networks are going even further in their desire to attract long-term

relationships with brands. Some of them are developing whole series designed to incorporate brand placements, so that advertisers are given the opportunity of placing their brands in the content of their choice at a very early stage (Ryan, 2003).

1.3.5 Virtual Product Placements

The development of brand placement is influenced not only by external factors such as the diminishing value of television commercials and long-term cooperation between the brands and the networks, but also by the technological advances within the field itself.

Virtual brand placement is a technique that allows for the digital insertion of the brand into a show after the show is filmed. Virtual placements have a history of being used in sports broadcasts to add billboards in the background of baseball games (Bauder, 1999).

However, the use of virtual or digital brand placements in television shows or movies is a relatively recent practice. This method offers significant value to the shows, since a space on the show can be sold over and over, in syndications and in various broadcasting regions for different products (Valenti, 2001; Goetzl, 2001). For advertisers, digital placements present a unique opportunity to tailor their brand placements to a particular audience demographically and geographically. Experts agree that to ensure the success of this technique, virtual placements should be done organically and seamlessly (Armstrong, 2001).

The pioneer of this practice has been Princeton Video Image, Inc., whose principal activities are developing and marketing a real-time video system to insert

images, including advertising images and program enhancements, into both live and pre-recorded television broadcasts on CBS, ESPN and other networks. The list of Princeton Video Image clients includes Volkswagen, TelCel, Heineken, Ford, Kodak, FedEx and other national brands, showing the variety and caliber of advertisers interested in this unique brand placement technique (Princeton Video Image Inc, homepage; Horovitz, 2000).

Faced with all these challenges, advertisers are looking for other ways to reach consumers and expose their brand to television and movie audience. Brand placement appears to have the ability to overcome the challenges that the industry currently faces.

Over the last several years, empirical evidence has shown that advertisers are embracing brand placement and branded content opportunities (Nelson and Steinberg, 2003). Several factors are assisting in the rapid development of this practice. The next section outlines the benefits of brand placement over traditional advertising both for marketers and studios.

1.4 BENEFITS AND DRAWBACKS OF BRAND PLACEMENT

- Brand placement is relatively cost efficient. While an average thirty-second commercial on a major television network costs from \$100,000 to \$500,000 to air, the insertion of a brand in television and other mass media programming might be less expensive. In some cases, the expense is limited to the costs of the products provided to the studios for free; in others, it is a fixed fee paid by manufacturer – ranging from \$25,000 to \$225,000 dollars, depending on the prominence of the placement or the program (Gupta & Lord, 1998). In special instances when the advertiser supports a

separate promotional arrangement for the program or movie, its overall costs can be very high. However, since this type of arrangement assumes multiple brand exposures during the campaign, the cost of single brand exposure may not be as high as the equivalent of advertising exposure.

- Beside its relative cost efficiency, the long shelf life of brand placements is often credited as one of the main benefits (Karrh 1998). A longer shelf life for programming, and consequently for the brands in that program, is attained via syndication of television programming, the video rental market, music recording and book publishing.

- Placements also give a brand a chance to enjoy “implied endorsements” from celebrities, if the brand is being used or mentioned by a character played by a famous actor/actress (“Let us put you in the movies,” 1996; Karrh, 1998; Morton & Friedman, 2002). The report of one famous advertising agency characterized placement as being as “powerful as celebrity endorsement, but more subtle... it’s conceivable that viewers will acknowledge and buy products used by idols on the big screen” (J. Walter Thompson USA 1989, p. 2, as cited in Karrh, 1998). As with the regular endorsements from a celebrity, marketers hope to receive some image rub-off from the celebrity to the product.

- Brand placement gives the possibility of demonstrating the product in its natural setting and/or use (Loro, 1990). Unlike traditional advertising, brand placement realistically portrays the product in the context of the scene (Curtis, 1996). As one ad agency executive explained: “With ordinary advertising you can only say so much. With

placement you can hint at what kind of product it is far more effectively” (Murdock, 1992, p2).

- Brand placement can overcome ad-eliminating behavior by consumers. Consumers have developed ways to avoid advertising messages. According to a recent Roper poll, 39% of consumers switch to another channel when ads come on; another 19% turn down or mute the TV (Ebenkamp, 2001). Zipping and zapping – eliminating or fast forwarding ads in recorded programs – and channel surfing, challenging issues for contemporary commercials, do not apply to brand placement.

- Brand placement delivers a message when the viewer is most attentive and even captive (Elliot, 1999). In most cases, viewers are unaware of the commercial intent of the message within the programming, which makes them more receptive to it (Gupta, Balasubramanian & Klassen, 2000).

1.4.1 Benefits of Brand Placement for Studios or Moviemakers

- The use of brand names in the production enhances its realism (Ebenkamp 2001, Gupta, Balasubramanian and Klassen 2000, Karrh 1998). Brands are integral parts of our lives; therefore, showing the branded products on the screen enhances the verisimilitude of the programming.

- Brand placement can satisfy the economic interest of the studios in several ways. First, if a script calls for the use of a particular product/brand, advertisers can provide the product free of charge to studios, which will save on the effort and expense of buying or renting products. Second, studios can also receive monetary compensation from the advertiser for a placing particular brand of product (Rosen, 1990). Third,

placements may facilitate attractive tie-in arrangements for the joint promotion of the movie or programming (Gupta, Balasubramanian & Klassen, 2000). Economic benefits of brand placements are not limited to TV placements alone. It can reduce out of pocket costs for music video productions, book publications and other media creations (Friedman, 2005; Karrh, 1998).

1.4.2 Drawbacks of Brand Placements

Though brand placement provides a number of very important benefits for all parties involved, it also has certain drawbacks that have to be acknowledged. They stem from the advertisers' lack of control over the brand placement process.

- In many cases in feature films, brands get dropped in the film's final cut, despite a preliminary agreement (Begrman, 1989; DeLorme & Reid, 1999; Karrh, 1998). For example, Reebok was seeking ten million dollars from TriStar pictures over a placement in "Jerry Maguire" that did not appear in the film's final version (Elliot, 1997) (although a version of the movie that aired on the cable network Showtime included a fictional Reebok ad over the closing credits at the end of the film – allegedly as a result of the lawsuit). One major marketer estimated that its placements fall through in about 30% of the cases (Turcotte, 1995).

- The brand can also get negative or unclear portrayal in a movie. For example, the mention of K-Mart in movie "Rainman". In some cases, advertisers can put a restriction or take active steps to ensure the use the brands only in positive light (DeLorme & Reid, 1999; Karrh, 1998). For example, McDonald's has used an agency to keep its products out of the feature films that might "offend the family unit"; Daimler

Chrysler's Mercedes-Benz declined the offer to place their car in "Traffic", because they didn't want their vehicles associated with drug dealers (Brennan, 2001).

- While brand placement overcomes challenges faced by commercials nowadays and gets the desired exposure for the brand offering cost efficient placements with potential of celebrity endorsements, long shelf life and brand portrayal in natural setting, the effectiveness of this technique as a marketing communication tool is not well determined yet. In fact, one of the largest advertising agencies, in its special report about this technique, mentions that one of the other challenges of brand placement is the difficulty of measuring its effects (J. Walter Thompson USA, 1989).

Just as brand placement effectiveness raises a lot of issues, the legal and social aspects of brand placement stimulate much discussion. The following section summarizes the issues brand placement faces from a legal and social perspective.

1.5 LEGAL AND SOCIAL ASPECTS OF BRAND PLACEMENT

1.5.1 Legal Issues Surrounding Brand Placement

As the practice of brand placement is becoming more popular in modern movie and television productions, concerns about the legal and social aspects of it are being raised. The potential for legal regulations of brand placement practices depends on whether or not they constitute commercial speech. Snyder (1992) and Lackey (1993) summarize the ongoing debate regarding this matter. Classifying brand placement as commercial speech would mean imposing certain regulations and restrictions on this

growing practice (Avery & Ferraro, 2000; Lackey, 1993). Though there are no laws governing the practice of brand placement, there have been such efforts in the past.

1.5.2 Previous Regulatory Efforts Affecting Brand Placement

Historically, public debate surrounding brand placement has focused on placement of potentially harmful or additive products, especially in programming targeted at children (Lackey, 1993). Congress has already considered two bills that would restrict placement of tobacco products in films. The “Protect our Children from Cigarettes Act of 1989” would have prohibited all tobacco consumer sales promotion that can be seen or heard by any person under the age of 18 (101 Congress, 1st session, HR 1250, 1989). The bill sought to restrict product placement by defining consumer sales promotion as any payment for the appearance of the registered brand name of a tobacco product in a movie or play. This bill failed in committee, with the reasoning that the limitations placed on cigarette advertising were excessively restrictive (Lackey, 1993). In the second session of the 101st Congress, Henry Waxman introduced the “Tobacco Control and Health Protection Act” (101 Congress, 1st session, HR 5041, 1989) that would have prohibited paid brand placement of cigarettes in any kind of entertainment programs. This bill passed in committee, but was not taken up by Congress (Lackey, 1993).

The threat of legislation has already had some effect. In 1990, tobacco companies voluntarily quit paying for brand placement. The Tobacco Institute unveiled industry

guidelines that formally eliminate paid brand placements in movies as part of the industry's initiatives to allegedly curb tobacco marketing to youths (Snyder, 1992).

The Center for Science in Public Interest has called on the FCC and state Attorneys General to require that brand placements be disclosed to movie and television audiences or be banned (Avery & Ferraro, 2000). Also, the Center for Study of Commercialism has asked the Federal Trade Commission to require that movie audiences be informed through on-screen disclosures whenever movies contain paid brand placements (Clark, 1991). In practice, however, movie producers "thank" participating corporations at the end of the film, even though they do not have to do so. Though this practice is becoming an industry standard, it is not clear whether and how that impinges on brand placement effectiveness. While all the proposed regulations deal with paid brand placements, unpaid brand placements are still left to the discretion of producers and do not require any acknowledgement.

1.5.3 The Ethical and Social Aspects of Brand Placement

The ethical aspects of brand placements remain controversial and have received considerable recent attention from researchers. Gupta and Gould (1997) divided the ethical issues surrounding brand placement into two groups: general ethical concerns regarding brand placement and concerns of placement of certain products as opposed to the others.

Research regarding general acceptance of the practice of brand placement showed that, overall, consumers do not mind brand placements in a program (Gupta, et al., 2000; Gupta & Gould, 1997; Nebenzahl & Secunda, 1993). This overall positive attitude

towards the practice of brand placement was stronger among frequent moviegoers/watchers (Gupta & Gould 1997) and among people who have a more positive attitude towards advertising (Gupta, Balasubramanian & Klassen, 2000). However, consumer attitudes change when considering ethically charged products such as guns and cigarettes (Gupta & Gould, 1997). Gupta et al (2000) suggest restricting the placement of such products in mass programming.

Regardless of the relative unanimity in the academic literature of the public's attitude towards brand placements, some consumer advocacy groups, as Commercial Alert, have requested the government to regulate the usage of this practice (Steinberg & Vranica, 2003), since it can influence viewers in "subtle and harmful ways" (Gupta, Balasubramanian & Klassen, 2000), given that the viewers are not aware of the commercial nature of the placements. Such critics recommend a full disclosure of placements in the beginning of the program, to let consumer make an informed decision about the desire to watch a program with those plug-ins. Recent trends influencing the further development of brand placement stimulate the debate on the social and legal aspects of the practice even more.

1.6 CHAPTER SUMMARY

The information presented above shows that brand placement is a developing technique that is attracting a lot of interest and attention from marketers and producers due to its potential unique benefits for the placed brand. Though the industry does have a number of examples of effectiveness of brand placement in various media, particularly in movies and television programming, the complete effects of brand placements on

consumers as well as the measurements of such effects are not totally clear. The next chapter discusses the existing research on brand placement effectiveness done up to this point. The results of academic research, as well as industry measurements, are presented to paint the overall picture of what we do know about the effectiveness of this increasingly popular technique.

Chapter 2: Research on Brand Placement Effectiveness –

What do we Know About Brand Placement?

As discussed in the first chapter, brand placement is *a method of marketing communication that includes the unobtrusive insertion of a brand or any brand identifier in the content of mass media programming, in return for monetary or other consideration, with the purpose of influencing the audience.* This chapter presents the existing research on brand placement effectiveness, discusses potential effects of this technique and its occurrences in various media, and outlines the questions that are not yet addressed by the existing research.

2.1 POTENTIAL EFFECTS OF BRAND PLACEMENT

One of the most visible effects of brand placement cited in literature is increase in sales. The current rise of interest to this practice came with the placement of Hershey's Reese's Pieces brand in E.T. Within a month, sales jumped 65% (Van Biema, 1982). BMW launched its Z3 model in the James Bond movie "GoldenEye" and doubled its expected order lists after the film's release (Mortimer, 2002). After the unplanned placements in "Toy Story," Etch A Sketch sales increased 4500%, Mr. Potato Head sales 800%, and Slinky production was revived with sales of \$27 million (York, 1999). Placement of the Equisearch.com website in the film "Horse Whisperer" for about thirty seconds, while the character was searching this website for a certain article, led to a doubling in number of visitors after the release of the film, and stayed high even after the movie was gone from the theaters (Buss, 1998).

These are only a handful of examples of the effect of brand placement on viewers' behavior – making them buy a particular brand, or go to a particular website. However, as with other forms of marketing communication, the effects of brand placement can range from affecting the memory to affecting attitudes.

Karrh (1994) suggests that brand placement has effects on consumers' memory, raising the salience of the brand. Brand salience has been defined as the prominence, or level of activation, of a brand in a memory (Alba & Chattopadhyay, 1986). Raising brand salience not only increases the recall of the brand, it also hinders the recall of the competing brands.

Changing viewers' attitudes towards the brand can also be one of the potential effects of brand placement (Vollmers & Mizerski, 1994). According to the Elaboration Likelihood Model and Mere Exposure Effect (Petty & Cacioppo, 1984a), viewers' exposure to the brand on the screen is expected to enhance their attitudes towards the brand. The section on measurement of brand placement effectiveness, later in this chapter, deals with these issues in more details.

However, not all brands placements have the same effects on memory, attitudes and behavior. The following section introduces the existing classifications of brand placements and potential effects of each type of placement.

2.2 DIFFERENCES IN BRAND PLACEMENT IN TERMS OF EXPOSURE, MODE AND TIME

Brand placements have been categorized along various dimensions depending on the nature of their appearance on the screen. The earliest categorization was done by Murdock (1992), where brand placements are distinguished as *creative* or *on-set*.

Creative placements are defined as those that appear on the background of the shot, whereas on-set placements are the ones that are displayed more prominently. This initial very broad division gave way to more complicated categorizations, which took into account both the modes of placements and their connection to the programming.

Gupta and Lord (1998) proposed a two-dimensional (mode of presentation and prominence) approach for categorizing different types of placements. Mode of presentation refers to the senses activated by the stimulus and can be divided into three different modes – visual only, audio only and audio-visual. Usually, visual dimension refers to the appearance of the brand on the screen without any verbal referrals or relevant sounds. Auditory or verbal dimension refers to the brand being mentioned in a dialogue without showing a product on the screen. The third mode – audio-visual is showing the brand and at the same time mentioning the brand name or providing relevant auditory information. Placement in any of these three modes can be prominent or subtle.

Prominent placements, according to Gupta and Lord (1998), are those in which the products (or other brand identifiers) are made highly visible by virtue of size and position on the screen or its centrality to the action on the screen. Subtle placements are those in which the brand is not shown notably – due to small size, being outside of the main focus of the camera or low time of exposure.

Russell (1998) proposed a somewhat similar categorization. Her tripartite typology of brand placements presents all the placements along three dimensions: visual or screen placements; auditory or script placements; and plot connection or plot placements. The visual and auditory dimensions are described similar to those in Gupta and Lord's definitions. Plot connection refers to the degree in which the brand is

integrated in the plot of the story, which to a certain extent resembles Gupta and Lord's prominence, but while the former is only limited to how close the brand is connected to the content of the programming, the latter also includes close-up shots of brands or time of exposure. Russell (1998) suggests that further categorization is possible, based on visual and auditory placements having various degrees, or depending on the number of appearances and mentions, angle of the camera shots, emphasis placed on the brand name, place in a dialogue, etc.

Such categorizations are very important, as both mode and prominence are relevant to the ease with which the brand can be incorporated into the programming, and therefore to the cost to the marketer (Gupta & Lord, 1998). Also, different types of placements are expected to have various degrees of impact on consumers' attitudes and memory. To fully capitalize on the brand placement's potential and choose the most appropriate placement, the effects of different types of placements should be researched and compared.

So far, only three studies have looked at the effects of type of placement on viewers' memory and attitudes – Gupta and Lord (1998); Brennan, Dubas and Babin (1999); and Russel (2002). Prominent placements have been reported as having higher recall than subtle placements (Gupta & Lord 1998). This is confirmed by Brennan, et al., (1999), who showed that on-set placements that are displayed more prominently, are better remembered than creative ones, displayed on background of the set. Auditory placements have higher recall (Gupta & Lord, 1998) and recognition (Russell, 2002), than visual placements, but lower than audio-visual placements (Gupta & Lord, 1998). Also, visual placements are better recognized if they have higher plot connection;

however, the degree of the plot connection does not affect memory in auditory placements (Russel, 2002). The research on interaction of plot connection and mode of placements and brand attitudes has shown that lower plot visual placements are more effective in influencing brand attitudes than higher visual placements; on the other hand, higher plot connected auditory placements are more effective than lower plot connected placements.

The effects of the time of exposure to the brand placement on viewers' brand recognition are not that clear yet. However, longer exposure time of creative placements (subtle, background placements) do not result in higher recognition scores, whereas longer on-set placements increase viewers' recognition, as long as the placements are not longer than ten seconds (Brennan, Dubas & Babin, 1999).

Several questions remain unanswered in this area. The following is an illustrative set: Are different modes and exposure times more effective with certain products or brands? How do different levels of each dimension influence effectiveness? What frequency of visual or auditory exposure is needed to achieve certain results on memory and attitudes of viewers? How do mode and exposure time interact with viewers' involvement with the show or their knowledge of the product category?

The next section will present brand placement practice in various media and outline general studies that explore the state of brand placement in that particular media. This will be followed by the section dealing with the measures of the effectiveness of brand placement.

2.3 BRAND PLACEMENT AND THE MEDIA

This section will deal with brand placement in various media – movies, television, video & computer games, music videos, song lyrics and books, and online. Each subsection outlines the current trends in placement in that media, with the effectiveness of such placements being measured in the section to follow.

2.3.1 Brand Placement in Movies

As discussed in Chapter 1, movies were the first vehicle for brand placements and currently remain one of the largest ones. Examples from successful brand placements, as listed above, come mainly from movies. This has also ensured that the majority of research done in the area of brand placement has been focused on brand placements in films (Babin & Carder, 1996; Gupta & Gould, 1997; Gupta & Lord, 1998; Karrh, 1994; McKenchie & Zhou, 2003; Morton & Friedman, 2002; Rossler & Bacher, 2001; and others). Sapolsky and Kinney (1994) reported the results of content analysis designed to document the amount and types of the brands placed in movies, based on a sample of 25 top grossing films of 1991. Their results show that among the 291 total instances of brand occurrences, the majority of the brands were low-involvement products. Of brand placements for high involvement products, the most common was for a car. Also, the majority of the placements involved brand use by major characters and “good characters”. In the focus group and in-depth interview research regarding the nature of brand placement in movies, DeLorme and Reid (1999) found that consumers connected the world of the film, including any brand appearing in that movie, to their own social world, including consumption-specific situations. This linkage is especially important in

examining the effectiveness of brand placement in movies. For studies measuring the effectiveness of brand placement in the movies, see the section “*Brand Placement Effectiveness Measures*” later in this chapter.

2.3.2 Brand Placement on Television

Several studies examined brand appearances on television. The very first two were commissioned by *Advertising Age* magazine in 1990 (Hume, 1990) and 1993 (Fawcett, 1993). The studies were based on content analyses of programs on CBS, NBC, ABC and FOX (second study only) during one full day of programming. Eight hundred eighteen and one thousand thirty five brand placement instances were found in the 1990 and 1993 studies respectively. Thirty-five percent were auditory placements, 15% were visual placements and 50% were audio-visual placements. The highest occurrences of brands were found in news programs (44%) and talk shows (14%).

The most recent study of brand appearances on television was done by Ferraro and Avery (2000). The study identified four basic ways a brand can appear in television programming. The first was current market and commercial activities (e.g., documentary, news programs etc.). Consistent with the findings of the previous research, the majority of the placements were found in this category. Given the type of the programming, the placements are explicit and brands appeared in the center of the programming. The second major place of brand appearance was sports programming. These placements are usually in the form of the billboards at the televised sporting events. The third place for brand placements was prizes on game shows. The form of such appearances resembles mini-ads. These three modes of portrayal constitute 57% of all brand appearances and

have explicit factual or commercial intent. The last mode of placement was in movies, sitcoms and dramas. In these placements, only 19.2 % of brands have positive portrayal ratings. Also, 30% of the visual and 96 % of the verbal placements were essential to the scene or dialogue they appeared in. Based on these results, the authors concluded that “the majority of brand portrayals in scripted television program do not blatantly persuade via dialogue or actions indicating liking, preference or endorsement for the brand; rather their persuasive intent is achieved through centrality to the action on the set and demonstrations of brand use and product attributes by characters” (Ferraro & Avery, 2000).

Several studies focused on the effectiveness of brand placement in television programming (Law & Braun, 2000; Russell 2002; and others). For a detailed analysis of those studies, see the section “*Brand Placement Effectiveness Measures*” later in this chapter.

2.3.3 Brand Placement in Video and Computer Games

Video and computer games are becoming increasingly popular as brand placement media. Experts note that currently marketers are making their brands play a more active role in the video and computer games – instead of just putting up a banner on the road of a race game, players deliver McDonald’s burgers and collect Nokia tunes. They even build new games around the brands (Gogoi & Sager, 2003).

Nelson (2002) identified the following uses of brands in computer and video games – *sponsorship or cross-selling*, when a game advertises a league, network, station etc.; *brands as major parts of game-play*, for example equipment or tools; *game*

characters are branded images – real or fictitious; *background ads* for self-promotion of the game publisher's name; *background licensed music and background brand placements* in the content of the game. The latter category was further subdivided into billboards and on-screen brand placements (Grigorovici & Constantin, 2004).

In one of the first studies on brand placements in computer and video games, Nelson (2002) proposed that cross-selling and using the brand as a major part of the game reinforces the brand image and helps players identify with the brand, whereas various background placements help build brand recall. Indeed, a study of the effects of background banners placed in computer games on players' memory (Shneider & Cornwell, 2005), showed that such placements enjoy high recall and recognition, which are further enhanced by their visibility and prominence. Within the background placement category, brand recall was shown to be better for billboards than for on-screen brand placements (Grigorovici & Constantin, 2004).

The only study examining the long-term memory effects of brand placement found that when the brand is relevant to players and they are actively involved with the process, they are able to recall brands both immediately following the game and after a five month period (Nelson, 2002). Besides involvement and relevance, the individual's experience with the game was also shown to influence the players' brand memory, with more experienced players having higher level of recall and recognition of the placed brands (Shneider & Cornwell, 2005). However, Chaney, Lin and Chaney (2004) argued that their study shows no relationship between the experience of the player and recall of the billboards. In addition, they found that the embedded billboards within the game had

very limited impact on either the enhancement of the game experience or on product purchase intentions.

Overall, just as with brand placements on television, brands in video and computer games are expected to add realism to the game (Nelson, 2002; Nelson, Keum & Yaros, 2004). So, for example, the placement of a gas company in a race car game is considered realistic. Grigorovici and Constantin (2004) showed that the similarity between the real world experience and the game facilitates brand recall and recognition. On the other side, research has shown that one of the factors enhancing players' recall of the placed brand was the perceived novelty of the brand in a particular context. For example, the Google search engine was better remembered than Exxon in a race game (Nelson, 2002). Other factors that were found to have an effect on players' reactions are arousability level, involvement, and presence. The more arousing the game is and subsequently, the higher the involvement, the lower brand recall and recognition; at the same time, and perhaps most importantly for advertisers, the more preferred the brand is.

Nelson, Keum and Yaros (2004) have examined players' attitudes towards brand placement in computer and video games. Using a combination of netographical and experimental methodology, they found that players' overall attitude towards advertising positively relates to their attitude towards brand placements, which in turn positively relates to the perceived influence of brand placement on purchase intentions.

Despite a miniscule number of studies available on the subject, video and computer games remain one of the most researched media of brand placement after television and film. More research is needed on characteristics of brand placement in the

game environment, and the specific aspects of games and how they affect players' responses to brand placement.

2.3.4 Brand Placement in Music Videos, Song Lyrics and Books

Placing a brand in a song's lyrics and music videos seems to be a natural extension of placement on television and in movies. Increasing number of songs, music videos, books have references to various brands. It would be reasonable to assume that such an increase is due to the fact that more brands are becoming part of our everyday life. For example, an early study of lyrics of hit songs from 1946-1980 revealed that the number and variety of brand names mentioned has increased significantly during the period under consideration (Friedman, 1986). Though similar recent studies are not available for comparison, it is reasonable to assume that the instances of brand names further increased from the 1980s to present times.

Brands are also being portrayed in music videos. For example, Celine Dion's recent air-travel-themed single, *You and I Were Meant to Fly*, is part of a promotional campaign of Air Canada, with Air Canada planes featured in the song's video. With the assumption probably being that the image of the singer and emotions felt for the song will be transferred to the placed brand, this method of promotion is developing very fast. However, no published research was found on either the effectiveness of such placements or their comparison with placements in other media.

Brand placement in print media is not a new concept either. Friedman (1986) examined the number of brands appearing in a sample of bestselling American novels from 1945 to 1975. The results show that books published in 70s have more than 500%

more brands named in them than books published in 40s. The study also revealed that the generic counterparts of the brand names (e.g., cars instead of Chevrolet) have not experienced a parallel increase. Though not certain, it is reasonable to assume that most, if not all, of these mentions are not paid. So far, there are several instances of paid brand placement in books. The very first one involved author Fay Weldon, who was paid by an Italian jewelry company to write a novel featuring Bulgari jewelry, titled *The Bulgari Connection*. There is no published evidence of how this affected readers' perceptions of the brand, their attitudes and brand preferences. However, several years later, another British author made a deal with Ford to integrate its Fiesta compact into her latest novel – *The Sweetest Taboo*. As with the previous case, no published evidence of effectiveness of such placements is available (“Product Placement Beyond TV”, 2005).

2.3.5 Brand Placement Online

From the traditional media for brand placements – television and film – the practice has moved towards other media – such as books, music videos and computer games. The most recent media for placement noted by the press is blogs. A good example is the Blogosphere initiative, run by a Canadian communication company, that recruits influential bloggers who commit to mentioning the company's clients on their sites in exchange for monetary compensation (“Product Placement Beyond TV”, 2005). No published studies were found on the effectiveness of such placements; however, with the technique developing very fast, the need for such studies is increasing.

In summary, what little existing research there is on brand placement in media other than TV and film confirms the findings and propositions of the research on brand

placement in traditional media, like the effect of prominence and involvement on memory. The attitudes towards brand placement in non-traditional media mirror the attitudes towards the placement in television and film, with viewers valuing enhanced realism brought in by placements and accepting placements that are relevant but not too obtrusive. Viewers' overall attitude towards advertising might be predictive of their attitudes towards the brand placements, both in traditional and non-traditional media. At this point, there are no published studies done on comparing brand placement across media. More research is needed to assess the relative effectiveness of brand placements in movies, television, computer and video games and other media, as well as factors influencing it. The next section introduces the measures to evaluate effectiveness used by brand placement experts and researchers.

2.4 BRAND PLACEMENT EFFECTIVENESS MEASURES

Traditional measures of effectiveness for any type of marketing communication have been memory measures – brand recall (aided and unaided) and recognition, attitude towards the brand, attitude towards the message, behavioral change or purchase intentions. The objective of any marketing communication message is to increase retrieval of brand name, brand attributes and benefits, measured in the degree it is remembered, or degree it changes the attitudes and behavior of the recipients of the message. Brand placement messages are no exception. Researchers and practitioners have been looking at the technique of brand placement through the effect it has on consumers' memory, attitudes towards the placed brand, and post-viewing behavior. This section introduces measurements and models that are used to capture those effects.

2.4.1 Memory

The effect of brand placement on memory, measured by consumers' recall and recognition of placed brands, is the most frequently used measure of effectiveness of brand placement, favored by practitioners and academicians (Karrh, 1998; Law & Braun, 2000; Russel, 1998). Researchers have been using both free recall – where viewers were asked to recall what brands they have seen in a movie/show (D'Astous & Chartier, 1999; Gupta & Lord, 1998; Vollmers & Mizerski, 1994) – and aided recall – where viewers were hinted by a category and then were asked to recall seeing any brand (Karrh, 1994). Recognition – where viewers are asked to judge whether they remember seeing the brand in a movie/show (Babin & Carter, 1996; Gupta & Lord, 1998) – is also a widely used measure.

A number of studies using different methodology and measurement scales have reported positive effects of brand placement on consumer memory. One of the first researchers to evaluate recall of a placed brand were Vollmers and Mizerski (1994). In their study, 98.3% of viewers correctly recalled the brands placed in the excerpts of the movies they were watching during the experiment. The effects on memory are confirmed in further studies where viewers remembered seeing the brand and/or being able to pick up the placed brand from the list of others (for example, Babin & Carder, 1998). In particular, studies found that audio-visual placements have the highest recall and recognition, while just audio placements have a better effect than just visual (Gupta & Lord, 1998; Law & Braun, 2000). Also it has been consistently shown that prominently placed brands (D'Astous & Chartier, 2000; Gupta & Lord, 1998) and placements that

have high plot connection, have higher recall (Law & Braun, 2000), and recognition (Brennan, Dubas & Babin, 1999) than just background drops and /or subtle placements.

D'Astous and Chartier (2000) also reported that the better the integration of the brand in the movie scene, (i.e., the higher the plot connection), the lower the recall of the placed brand. On the positive side, the presence of the main actor increases the recall and recognition of the placement (also supported by Russel, 2002 and Rossler & Bacher, 2001).

However, some researchers question the effects of brand placement on memory. In their two-group experimental study, Babin and Carder (1996b) reported that viewers in one group were able to correctly recognize 40% of brands that appeared in a movie they saw, whereas viewers from the second group recognized only 20%, with both groups picking from a list of the brands that did not show up in the movie. From these results, they deduced that the effect of brand placement on viewers' recognition is not conclusive. These results confirm the findings of Karrh's earlier work (1994), where he examined brand salience (i.e., prominence or level of activation of a brand in consumer memory) as a measure of effect on memory. Top of the mind recall was used as a brand salience measure, where viewers were asked to list the first three brands that came to mind in the brand category in question. The results indicated that brand salience was not significantly raised for the placed brands (except for one brand from a product category that viewers were not very familiar with). Karrh concluded that brand placement might be most effective for less familiar brand categories.

As shown above, existing research already provides some answers to the questions regarding the impact of brand placement on memory. However, some further

issues of interest remain unanswered, including the following: Does brand placement have similar effects for high and low involvement products? How long does the effect of brand placement on memory last? How does the memory of brand placement affect the attitude towards the placed brand?

2.4.2 Attitude Towards the Brand

A few studies have reported examining placement effects on attitudes toward a product or brand. Those that did usually measured brand attitudes using several semantic differential statements (Vollmers & Mizerski, 1994), therefore relying mostly of respondents' self-reports.

Babin and Carder (1996b) reported that viewing an excerpt from a movie with a specific brand placement did not change viewers' attitudes towards that brand. Their results are consistent with previous research by Vollmers (1995), Vollmers and Mizerski (1994), and Karrh (1994), who reported no significant differences between brand attitudes of participants exposed to brand placement and those who were not.

Russell (2002) has demonstrated that modal (verbal and visual) and plot connection variations may be able to affect attitudes towards a brand, and she suggests that brands highly connected to the plot of a movie or programming might affect consumers' attitudes most favorably when the brand name is verbally mentioned on the show. Brands with low plot connection may also be able to optimize their effect through visual placements. However, as her study did not examine the difference in brand attitudes between placement-exposed viewers and a baseline (i.e., pretest or control) measure, it is uncertain whether such effects are demonstrable.

The effect of brand placement on brand attitudes has also been examined across cultures. Rossler and Bacher (2001) measured brand evaluations of American and German viewers before and after their exposure to brand placements. While brand evaluations remained rather constant among German viewers, nearly all criteria of brand evaluations increased among American viewers. In addition, when asked about their individual perception of brand placement effects, both American and German viewers agreed that their brand perception was positively changed due to the placements.

In summary, although research has confirmed the effects of brand placement on recall and recognition, so far it has failed to demonstrate effects on attitudes towards a placed product or brand. The main question still remaining unanswered in this area is whether brand placement influences viewers' attitudes towards that brand. And if in fact such influence exists, what are the factors affecting this relationship?

2.4.3 Purchase Intention and Viewers' Choice of Brand

Only a small number of studies have examined the effects of brand placement and viewers' subsequent usage or purchase intentions or behavior. The measures of behavior and/or intentions used are rather diverse in those studies.

Baker and Crawford (1995, as reported in Morton & Friedman, 2002) found that self-reported purchase intentions were higher for placed brands than for brands that were not. The Morton and Friedman study (2002), researching how general beliefs about brand placement affect behavior, assessed behavior through a multi-component construct that measures the respondents' self-reported product usage behavior as an outcome of their exposure to brand placements in movies. Respondents were asked to answer "yes" or

“no” to the following four statements representing component variables: I have looked for a product in the store after seeing it in a movie (search); I have started using a brand after seeing it in a movie (use); I have stopped using a brand after seeing it in a movie (discontinued use); I wanted to try a brand after seeing it in a movie (trial). Research has shown that a subset of such beliefs can be useful in predicting usage behavior for the placed brands. In addition, research data suggests that positive product portrayals can add to consumers’ decisions to use the placed brands, whereas negative portrayals can lead to discontinued use.

A recent study examined the effects of brand placement on children’s brand choice after their exposure to a scene from *Home Alone* that shows Pepsi-Cola being spilled during a meal. The children’s brand choice was measured unobtrusively, as children were invited to help themselves to a Pepsi or Coke at the outset of the individual interviews (Auty & Lewis, 2004). The results show that children chose Pepsi at a significantly higher rate than Coke. However, follow-up interviews with the children suggested that it is not simply exposure to the film but rather previous exposure together with a reminder in the form of recent exposure that affects choice.

In one brand placement research, choice of brand was measured by offering respondents a scenario. After exposure to clips from a television shows that included several brand placements, Law and Braun (2000) asked respondents to participate in a scenario where they would have to shop for a friend who had just moved into a new apartment. To ensure disassociation between the explicit memory and behavior, prior to exercise respondents were told that they are participating in another experiment, unrelated to the one with exposure to brand placements. Respondents were given a list of

items and brands preferred by a friend and asked to check off the ones they would choose. The list included items and brands from the clips shown. The research results indicate that the centrality (plot connection) of placement has no effect on choice, whereas placement mode significantly affects choice, with the visual placements being most influential, but least memorable. The audio-visual placements are the most memorable ones, but least influential.

Gould, Gupta and Grabner-Krauter (2000), in their cross-cultural analysis of effects of brand placement on Austrian, French and American consumers, reported the effects that gender and ethnicity have on purchase intentions – with American consumers more likely to purchase brands they see in movies, than French or Austrian consumers. Males were also reported to be more likely “to buy brands they see movie stars using or holding in the movies.”

In summary, unobtrusive measure of choice shows that brand placements do in fact have certain effects of consumers’ brand choice. Some research suggests that repeated exposure might be one of the important factors for such effects. Often the most memorable placements are also least effective in affecting consumers’ choice. Another proxy for behavior – viewers’ self-reported purchase intentions – can be predicted using a subset of beliefs about the practice of brand placement.

The effects of brand placement on behavior are among the most important ones for marketers. A number of issues in this area still remain unanswered. Among these are: How does mode of placement affect purchase intentions or choice? Does involvement with the show or the actor/character using the brand affect viewers’ behavior or choice of brand? How does involvement with the show or character using the brand on choice

affects choice or purchase behavior? Is such influence different for different types of products?

2.4.4 Attitude Towards Brand Placements

Consumer's attitudes towards advertising and other type of marketing communication have been known to influence his attitudes and reactions towards the advertised brand (Andrews, 1989). Similarly, researchers have been looking at viewers' attitude towards the practice of brand placement in general and how that affects the attitudes towards the placed brand. In other words, the acceptability of the practice of brand placement has been considered a precursor aspect of effectiveness in terms of effects on viewers' recall, recognition and behavior (Gupta & Gould, 1993).

One of the first studies that examined viewers' attitudes towards the practice of brand placement was Nebenzahl and Secunda's study in 1993. It concluded that in general consumers do not object to brand placements. The majority of respondents considered them as an effective way of marketing communication (70% thought that brand placement is a good idea and 52% felt it should be allowed or even encouraged).

Though viewers generally have positive attitudes towards brand placement, those with negative views were motivated by ethical concerns. Gupta and Gould (1997) looked at whether viewers accept brand placements for certain products and how their demographic and other characteristics influence their attitudes. The results show that soft drinks and healthy consumer products are viewed as the most acceptable; however, placement of cigarettes, alcohol and guns of any brand was considered highly unacceptable by most of the respondents. Movie-watching habits and gender had a

significant effect on the viewers' acceptance of ethically charged products – frequent movie-watchers and males showed a higher tolerance for placements of cigarettes, guns and alcohol.

Gupta, Balasubramanian and Klassen (2000) analyzed survey data on viewers' attitude towards brand placement and how viewers' predisposition towards advertising and commercial messages in general affected their attitudes towards brand placement. The results confirmed the finding of earlier research that overall, people have positive perceptions of the practice (Nebezahl & Secunda, 1993) – most of the respondents did not mind placements and believed that placements make movies realistic and preferred seeing real brands in the movies. Most respondents also agreed that prior knowledge of placements in movies would not affect their desire to watch the movie. However, as was expected, people with less positive attitudes towards advertising had stronger feelings about the negative aspects of brand placement (like placements of ethically charged products) and believed that marketers disguise their brands as props in movies.

Research has proved that one of the main traits of brand placement – integration in the content of the programming – is an important characteristic in the formation of viewers' attitudes towards brand placement. The placements that are better integrated in the content of programming are better liked and are less likely to be perceived as unacceptable. However, better integrated placements are remembered less (D'Astous & Chartier, 2000).

Attitudes towards brand placements were also tested in cross-cultural studies (Gould, et al., 2000; McKechnie & Zhou, 2003; Rossler & Bacher, 2001). Gould, Gupta & Grabner-Krauter, (2000) using the Gupta and Gould (1997) study as a base, conducted

a comparison of brand placement attitudes among Austrian, French and American viewers. The results indicate that international viewers differ in their acceptance of ethically charged products such as alcohol, cigarettes and guns, but do not differ in their acceptance of the rest of the placed products. In general, American viewers have higher acceptance levels than French and Austrian ones and they were more likely to report that they would purchase the brands they have seen in the movies. In addition, respondents with favorable attitudes towards brand placements from all three countries were more likely to claim that they would purchase the brand placed in the movies. Other results were consistent with the findings of Gupta and Gould (1997), showing that males and frequent moviegoers were more accepting of placements involving ethically charged products.

Building on Gould, et al., (2000) and Gupta and Gould (1997), McKechnie and Zhou (2003) compared the attitudes towards brand placement among Chinese and American viewers. The results show that Chinese consumers are generally less accepting of brand placement than American consumers. Consistent with the findings of Gupta and Gould (1997) and Gould, et al., (2000), viewers in both countries showed less acceptance for placement of ethically charged products, but unlike with US viewers, gender and frequency of watching movies did not play a major role among Chinese viewers.

These findings are somewhat consistent with the research of Rossler and Bacher (2001), reporting that American viewers have more positive attitudes towards brand placement overall than German viewers. The main reason for the American's positive attitude towards placements was the enhancement of the realism of the story. Americans were also more willing to buy a brand they saw placed in the movie.

To summarize, research results have shown that viewers generally have a positive attitudes towards the brand placement technique, except for the placement of ethically charged products like cigarettes, guns and alcohol. The placement of such products is seen as more acceptable by men than by women, and by frequent moviegoers. It was also shown viewers who have better attitudes towards advertising in general, also share better attitudes towards brand placement.

Though many questions in this area have already received researchers' attention, some issues still need additional study. For example: Will a negative attitude towards brand placement in general hinder the effectiveness of this technique and if yes, how negative (or positive) will the attitude have to be to actually affect the effectiveness of brand placement? Does the acceptability of certain products and brands depend of the type of movie or programming they are placed in, and is there any difference in the acceptance of certain products depending on the watching environment (movie theater vs. video or DVD rental, or on television)?

So far, this section introduced the measures of effectiveness used in brand placement research by academic researchers. As discussed, memory measures remain one of the most popular ways to judge whether the placements were effective or not. Attitude and behavioral measures used in most cases were not very effective in capturing the effects of brand placement. This can be explained either by a lack of effects of brand placement on attitude and behavior, or by a lack of sensitivity in the existing measures to capture these effects. More research needs to be done in order to answer this question. The next part of this section presents several models developed by various industry

experts for measuring effectiveness and developing common standards for brand placement valuation.

2.5 STANDARDS FOR COMPARING BRAND PLACEMENT EFFECTIVENESS

Brand placement is developing fast and many marketers are employing this technique in their marketing mix; however, there still are no widely acceptable pricing and valuation standards for it. Industry specialists agree that development of common standards of measurement of brand placement effectiveness will help agencies, marketers and broadcasters in their strategic planning and evaluation (Hank & Kim, 2003). However, industry experts also point out that development of such highly refined standards is a very difficult task, due to a number of factors – the main ones being that the effects of brand placement might be hard to separate from the effects of advertising and other promotional activities (Karrh, 2003) and that a large number of factors and characteristics are incorporated in each brand placement.

Realizing the importance of such measures, practitioners are calling for research programs that explore the relationship between placement characteristics, audience reactions/interpretations, and brand placement practices (DeLorme & Reid, 1999). Many research companies answer this call by proposing their own models and systems of measurement as possible solutions for valuation of brand placements. Among those companies are Intermedia Advertising Group, iTVX and Neisen Media Research Group, whose models are briefly presented below.

Intermedia Advertising Group (IAG): Their In-Program Performance service employs a methodology assessing brand placements in prime-time reality shows, sitcoms

and sports programming by collecting data via subsets of an online panel that consists of 400,000 members (Hank & Kim, 2003). Eighty thousand surveys daily monitor performance factors – general recall of the program, brand recall, and fit (percentage of viewers who view a placement as fitting seamlessly and naturally into a program).

IAG also records tracking data consisting of twenty attributes for each brand placement – including exposure type, show genre, duration, brand clarity, type of use, etc. By correlating these data points with performance factors, marketers can identify the types of placements and sponsorships that are most effective for their brands (IAG homepage). IAG does not assign monetary value to the placements; rather it provides the data on viewers' responses to brand placements, which if used with marketers' own sales and marketing data can determine their return on investment.

iTVX: This information technology company was created with the specific purpose of continuously measuring the “quality” of brand placements. The company developed a quantitative metric known as a Q-Ratio™, which is based on the simultaneous calculation of fifty variables (factors) that are classified into four groups: *Impact* and *Impact Adjustment* Factors and *Awareness* and *Awareness Adjustment* Factors.

Impact Factors assesses the modality of placements using ten hierarchical levels of product placements – from the lowest (Background) to the highest (Verbal Plus). *Impact Adjustment Factors*, as its name suggests, adjust the *Impact Factors* by a placement's presence, clarity, and integration into the program. *Awareness Factors* calculate a viewer's awareness and recall of the content and compares them to their awareness and recall of commercials in the same show. *Awareness Adjustment Factors*

adjust the *Awareness Factors* by multiple parameters, including venue (from viewing commercial TV to viewing an IMAX movie), tie-in promotions, billboards and strategic commercial positioning, program/brand alignment, engaging vs. intrusive attributes, and placement positioning on the program.

The Q-Ratio™ is expressed either as a decimal fraction of a thirty-second commercial, or as the number of commercials to which it is equivalent, i.e. Q-Ratio™ estimates how many commercials or what percentage of a commercial in the same show the integration is worth.

Nielsen Media Research: Nielsen Media Research has launched the Place*Views project that enables users to track brand placement by providing a comprehensive database of information about all brand placement occurrences on all six broadcast networks. The data can be accessed via a web-based application, with full motion video and audio clips of placements. That information can be sorted by network, program, airdate, advertiser, brand and category. Each placement is coded using descriptive attributes about the placement, such as foreground, background, prop, video and/or audio. The key point of this system is that it also provides the ratings of the program within which the placement appeared on at the exact time when the brand was shown. Along with the ratings, the application displays the demographic profile of the viewing audience at the time of the placement.

Brand Advisors: This is the only placement measurement firm that focuses solely on valuing brand placement in feature films. As a base for their measurement system, they use cost per thousand (CPM) to reach the film's demographics through a 30-second spot on television. After that, based on movie's forecasted audience size Brand

Advisors collects various characteristics of the placement and produces a dollar value for the placement (Schiller, 2004a).

Delivery Agent: To evaluate the effectiveness of brand placement, this company uses data it compiles from sales of brands worn, placed, featured or utilized in particular movies and television programs via its Internet-based shopping service. Their extensive placement database includes information on twenty-five different attributes describing each placement. Based on the number of viewers who either purchased or showed interest in a brand that appeared in a TV show or movie, Delivery Agent provides transactional data to demonstrate how effective the placement was in creating demand for the brand. Delivery Agent also offers clients predictive models based on its historical transactional data to help them determine what kinds of brand placements will be successful for a specific type of product (Schiller, 2004a).

Propaganda Entertainment Marketing: The valuation service of this company uses models initially developed for sponsorship of sport and cultural events and it proposes an average global CPM of nineteen dollars and twenty cents for placements. Based on that CPM, Propaganda evaluates brand placements by taking into account the audience size, a “*freshness*” *factor* that determines the value of the placement to the brand in re-runs or syndication, and a *recall factor* that takes into account viewers’ response to and recall of similar placements (derived from Propaganda’s own separate research). The company also offers another service that evaluates placements relative to thirty-second commercials for clients who prefer direct comparisons of brand placement and advertising (Schiller, 2004a).

Image Impact: Similar to the model used by Propaganda, Image Impact applies a system initially developed for evaluating sponsorships to estimate the value of brand placement. The company assigns a signage value index to each brand placement based on three different attributes: time on screen, whether the product appeared alone on screen, and the size and visibility of the placement. Then through their software, that value index is translated into monetary value based on the price of a thirty-second commercial in the show where the placement appeared (Schiller, 2004a).

Joyce Julius and Associates: Just like the previous two companies, this measurement service utilizes the sports sponsorship methodology in evaluating brand placements. Using their software that takes into account the attributes of each placement, each second of the placement is valued at between 10% and 100% of the per-second cost of a thirty-second spot on the same program (Schiller, 2004a).

IEG: This company uses a number of placement attributes in its valuation model, such as creative quality of the placement, competing images on screen, and incidence of implied celebrity endorsement for the brand. Like many of its competitors, IEG bases its valuation of television placements on the price of a thirty-second commercial on the same show (Schiller, 2004a).

CinemaScores: Probably the oldest system in place, CinemaScores was specifically designed for determining the cost of brand placement for marketers. For newly released films, the company conducts exit surveys among moviegoers at different show times, in different theaters across the country. The information collected contains demographic data, brands that viewers remember seeing and viewers' liking of the movie. Using their copyrighted formula, CinemaScore computes how much brand

placement should cost in that movie, based on viewers' brand recall and box-office receipts (Sharkey, 1988).

As described above, while the methodologies used by various evaluation firms to estimate the value of brand placements vary significantly, several common features can be noted. Many of them value the brand placement against thirty-second commercials, using cost per thousand (CPM) of a thirty-second spot as a baseline for evaluation. Measurement companies also factor in a number of attributes describing placements, such as duration, level of integration in the content of programming, mode of placement, and connection to the character on screen, etc. A few of the systems also look at the consumers' responses to the placement, integrating their recall, recognition and behavior into the valuation system.

However, none of the existing metrics is comprehensive enough for the industry to agree on using it as a general standard (Schiller, 2004b). Though using a thirty-second TV spot as a benchmark for evaluation of brand placement makes the process very familiar – both for marketers and networks and show producers – it might oversimplify the measurement, since many placements are intended for brand enhancement and brand image development, which cannot get reflected in such a measurement process (Schiller, 2004b). Also, while many of the valuation systems look at numerous attributes describing each placement, not many have consumer characteristics, responses and reactions – recall, attitudes and others as input variables – in their models. The next section presents several factors that should be considered in the measurement of brand placement effectiveness.

2.6 OTHER FACTORS IN THE MEASUREMENT OF BRAND PLACEMENT EFFECTIVENESS

Some factors should receive special attention in brand placement research. The viewers' characteristics can influence the way brand placement affects them. First, it has been proposed that viewers' familiarity with the product category might influence how they perceive the brand placement (Karrh, 1994).

Second, some evidence suggests that there is a positive relationship between movie assessment and brand evaluations (Rossler & Bacher 2001). So the more viewers enjoy the movie or programming, the better their evaluation of the placed brand. Sometimes, this relationship can work in reverse. Rossler & Bacher (2001) reported that some respondents mentioned that the placement of the BMW car in "Tomorrow Never Dies" positively affected their perception of the movie. So not only can attitude towards the movie influence attitudes towards the placement, but attitude towards the placed brand positively affects attitudes towards the movie or programming.

Third, some researchers suggest that the following also matter in determining the effectiveness of brand placement – the relationships between traits perceived in the character associated with the brand; the viewers' desire to identify with the character; and the viewers' beliefs about brands' ability to convey that identification (Karrh, 1995a; Russel, 1998).

The characteristics mentioned above are viewer specific; however, there are some factors that are specific to the placement environment that may influence the placement effectiveness. First, the type of movie or programming may have an impact on how the brand placement affects viewers – are sitcoms better than action movies or thrillers?

Second, the type of character using or associated with the brand – does it matter if the brand is associated with a good guy or a bad guy in the movie, as long as they receive similar exposure? Third, the place of the exposure – is the impact of brand placement the same if the movie is watched on TV versus in a theater? These are some examples of individual and environmental factors that may have an effect on the outcome of brand placement. More research is needed to answer these questions and identify new venues for deepening our understanding of brand placement.

2.7 CHAPTER SUMMARY

Brand placement is viewed as one of the ways to create familiarity and consumer awareness and have a positive impact on consumer preferences and intentions to buy (Gupta, Balasubramanian, & Klassen, 2000). This section introduced the existing research on effectiveness of brand placement in various media. Though this practice is getting popular in the vast majority of media, the main research is still focused on brand placement in movies and television, with digital media slowly catching up. As discussed in this chapter, memory measures, such as recall and recognition, serve as the main measures of effectiveness.

Many studies have demonstrated how brand placement affects viewers' recall and recognition, and how characteristics of the placement (mode, prominence and plot connection) impact the effectiveness of brand placement. However, so far research has not demonstrated the effects of brand placement on attitudes. This can be explained either by a lack of such effects, or by a lack of sensitivity within existing measures to capture

these effects. Some studies were able to show the impact of brand placement on viewers' behavior – choice of brand – whereas others negate the possible effects on behavior.

This chapter also discussed various commercial methods to estimate the effectiveness of brand placements and their specific characteristics, which brings forward the need of developing more complete models to measure the effects of this growing practice. Each section in this chapter proposed a range of issues that need further research and examination.

Though this proposed study cannot address all of them, it will go beyond measuring the effects of brand placement on memory, and will concentrate on the impact on attitudes and behavior. Overall, the purpose of this research is two-fold: First, to investigate the influence of brand placement on viewers' attitude and behavior by identifying and testing the various factors that are believed to have an influence. Second, to evaluate the use of alternative measures in detecting the true effects of brand placement on consumers. Chapter 3 presents a number of theories applicable to research in brand placement. Each theory is briefly outlined, then followed by its implications for brand placement research.

Chapter 3: *Theoretical Foundations of Brand Placement*

In order to establish a solid framework for studying brand placement effectiveness, this chapter reviews a number of theories and concepts from the fields of consumer behavior and advertising that are used in developing the hypotheses for this research study. The second part of the chapter presents additional concepts and theories, which though not directly used in this study, have an influence on brand placement effectiveness and evaluation. All the theories and concepts outlined below are followed by a discussion of their possible implications for brand placement research.

3.1 EXISTING MODELS OF HOW BRAND PLACEMENT WORKS

Brand placement researchers have proposed several theories, stemming from advertising and consumer behavior research, in their attempts to develop a unified model of brand placement that explains its effectiveness via various factors. One such model explaining the potential influence of brand placement was proposed by Karrh (1998a). In this model, he postulates that a placed brand might be a power that bridges a perceived gap between identity characteristics currently held by viewers and those that are desired by them, and which are presented by a placement associated media character through a brand use.

Karrh notes that brand, audience and placement characteristics are likely to influence the applicability of this model. Brand characteristics include the extent to which the brand carries a clear social message and is available to viewers. Audience

characteristics include their motivation and ability to claim the desired characteristics, and placement characteristics include opportunity to process the placements – prominence and time on screen, and the degree to which the brand is linked to the desired characteristic.

As building blocks for his framework, Karrh (1998a) used the literature on identity development, representing both the ways a person sees himself and the way others see him. Just as identity factor is important in perception of self and others, television and movie audiences are “actively scanning the program for cues about characters, their identity characteristics and their likely actions.” Brands fit very well in this environment as makers of individual characteristics in creation of a desired identity for a viewer. A second main building block of Karrh’s framework is the symbolic meaning of a brand. He argues that brands are useful and well understood symbols that can carry important social information. In this sense, how much the viewers likes the placement associated character, how similar he feels to that character and how strong his desire is to be like that character, influence the way that the viewer will pick up on a symbolic meaning of a brand associated with the character. For a detailed review of identity links and the symbolic meaning of brands, refer to Karrh (1998a).

Though overall this model provides a good start for explaining the effectiveness of brand placement, it cannot be used for all placements. For example, while it can explain the prominent placement of the *Pottery Barn* brand in one of the episodes of the popular TV show *Friends*, with a very popular and attractive character admitting to shop exclusively at *Pottery Barn*, this model cannot provide an explanation for the subtle placement of a *Ragu* brand in one of the episodes of *Everybody Loves Raymond*, where

the brand is just visible on the screen during one of the scenes and is not in anyway associated with one of the characters.

Another model explaining the effectiveness of brand placement was proposed by Russell (2002). In her tripartite model, she categorized placements along three dimensions: visual, auditory and plot connection. Research of modality of presentation in audio-visual contexts suggests that auditory and visual information differ in amount of meaning they carry (see Russell 2002 for review). Audio information is usually considered more meaningful than visual. So, in Russell's classification, visual placement of a brand weakly connected to the plot or audio placement of a brand highly connected to the plot constitute congruent situations, whereas audio placement of a brand weakly connected to the plot or visual placement of a brand highly connected to the plot are incongruent. The model further suggests that though incongruent placements are better remembered than congruent ones, congruent ones are more effective in affecting viewers' attitudes.

The main building block of Russell's tripartite typology of brand placement is modality of presentation in audio-visual context. The author discusses that audio information carries not only higher meaning, but also higher intrinsic alerting properties and is more intrusive. She concludes that more meaningful stimuli become better "integrated in person's cognitive structure, are processed more deeply and generate better recall." A second block in Russell's framework is plot connection. She brings evidence of prior research in the film industry that primary implicit information from an important part of the movie is better remembered than secondary explicit information, due to the fact that the former carries more meaning for the story. So, she concludes that the level of

plot connection may determine the role and meaningfulness of a brand placement, which in turn will impact its effectiveness.

This model provides a foundation for evaluating brand placement based on the prominence and technical characteristics of the placement. However, this model fails to take into consideration viewers' unique characteristics that might affect placements.

3.2 OTHER MODELS AND THEORIES APPLIED TO BRAND PLACEMENT

The models presented above are the most prominent ones up to this point in brand placement research. The other studies in this area either use these models as a basis for developing hypotheses, or focus on developing and proving separate hypotheses about specific effects of brand placement, without combining them into a big picture of how brand placement works.

Most of the latter research, in their explanation of how brand placement works and development of their hypotheses, rely on some dual process theories, in particular Elaboration Likelihood Model and MODE (Motivation and Opportunity as Determinants of how attitudes influence behavior)model. In addition to these two models, other concepts and theories that come up in explanations of various effects of brand placement are: low involvement learning, presence and mere exposure effect. Each of these are discussed in further detail later in this chapter.

3.2.1 Elaboration Likelihood Model

Most cognitive response approaches to attitude formation assume that the recipients of a persuasive message act rationally in their attitude formation process. The

Elaboration Likelihood Model, on the other hand, “views recipients of a persuasive message neither invariantly cognitive nor universally mindless.” (Petty & Cacioppo 1984a). In their Elaboration Likelihood Model (ELM), Petty and Cacioppo (1984a) suggest the existence of two distinct routes of attitude change when processing a marketing communication message. Various factors determine viewers’ motivation and ability to elaborate on provided arguments. The theory proposes that if a consumer has the motivation and ability to engage in issue-relevant thinking, he activates the central processing route. In this case, he is likely to scrutinize the appeal, elaborate upon the provided message/arguments, draw conclusions about the merits of the arguments and consequently derive an evaluation of, or attitude towards, a brand or product. When the elaboration likelihood is low, i.e., the consumer lacks either the motivation or ability to process the message, the peripheral route is activated. Here, the acceptance or the rejection of the appeal is not based on careful consideration of the issue-relevant information, but rather it is based on the issue or object associated with positive or negative cues, which have no intrinsic link to the attitude stimulus (e.g., a beautiful model associated with brand serves as “evidence” that a beauty product works.). The consumer also draws simple inferences based on various cues in the persuasion context (e.g., the longer the message, the better the product must be) (Petty & Cacioppo 1984a). In addition, in such conditions mere exposure effects (Zajonc 1968) and heuristics shortcuts (Chaiken 1980) are brought into play.

Bagozzi, Guham-Canli and Priester (2002) classified the factors that influence consumers’ motivation in two groups: individual differences and situational differences. One of the most studied individual differences in persuasion is the need for cognition

(Cacioppo & Petty, 1982; Cacioppo, Petty & Kao, 1984), which measures an individual's intrinsic enjoyment and motivation to thoughtfully evaluate information. Individuals with high need for cognition enjoy elaborating whereas individuals with low need of cognition rely upon non-thoughtful persuasion processes. This doesn't mean that individuals with low need for cognition do not elaborate on persuasive information, or individuals with high need for cognition always elaborate. Overall, individual differences in need for cognition provide a baseline of elaboration likelihood, which can be affected by situational factors.

Bagozzi, et al., (2002) cited personal relevance (i.e. involvement) as the most important situational variable influencing elaboration. If the presentation of a message increases perceptions of involvement, then elaboration is likely to increase (see Bagozzi, et al., (2002) for detailed review of the papers in this area). Many variables have been found to have an influence on consumers' motivation to elaborate on persuasive information – such as feelings of ambivalence about the message topic, messages authored by stigmatized sources, loss of control. Among the variables of specific interest for brand placement research is a surprise factor (Maheswaran & Chaiken 1991). A number of other factors influence a consumers' ability to elaborate – distraction, extent to which the information in the persuasion message is available, time pressure, physiological arousal, etc.

In determining whether the information will be processed using central or peripheral cues, Petty, Cacioppo and Schumann (1983) suggested that involvement with the situation also plays a role, in addition to motivation and ability. They showed that if

the viewers are less involved with the situation, they are more likely to elaborate on peripheral cues, whereas under high involvement the opposite is true.

Elaboration Likelihood Model and Brand Placement

In the context of brand placement, the attention of the viewer is directed towards the movie stimuli, comprehension of a movie/show plot and development of the characters, and not towards the attributes of the product placed in the movie. In such situations, a viewer is not likely to actively seek out product information, which means that his/her attitude formation will follow the peripheral route of persuasion (Karrh, 1994; Stratton, 1992). As a result, a viewer is not likely to counter-argue or critically evaluate any information about the brand in the movie. As Petty and Cacioppo (1984b) suggested, under such conditions, sources serve as simple but effective cues for formation of attitude toward the brand. In case of brand placement a source can be a movie character, the movie itself, or any other positive or negative stimuli associated with the movie.

3.2.2 MODE Model and Implicit Attitudes

With ELM providing a possible explanation of how persuasive attempts influence formation of attitudes in case of brand placement, Fazio's MODE model can serve as a further explanation of how attitudes towards the brand influence viewers' behavior. A consumers' behavior is not always based on well-reasoned and thought-through arguments (Hawkins & Hoch, 1992). Behavior can sometimes be spontaneously produced by activation of attitudes (Fazio, 1990). The model that got developed from this notion is called MODE – Motivation and Opportunity as Determinants of how attitudes influence behavior. The model states that when people do have the opportunity or

motivation to consider the consequences of their actions, explicit attitudes are the main drivers of behavior. When one or both of these conditions is absent, they employ implicit attitudes (Chaiken & Trope, 1999; Wagner, 2001).

An implicit attitude can be automatically activated from memory by observing either the attitude objects or any cues associated with that attitude object. That activation depends on the extent of attitude accessibility, i.e. strength of association between attitude object and evaluation in memory. After attitude activation, the features of an object congruent with one's attitude are selectively perceived (Bagozzi, Gurhan-Canli & Priester, 2002).

MODE Model and Brand Placement

Watching a movie or any other programming with brand placement in it, viewers are likely to lack motivation and/opportunity to attend to brand information. Following the postulates of the MODE model, it is reasonable to assume that in such situations, brand placement is activating the implicit attitudes of viewers. The placement of the brand creates a set of cues and associations, connected to that brand, which in turn enhance the impact on implicit attitudes. As the MODE model proposes, the stronger these associations are, the faster the implicit attitude is activated. So, in evaluating the effects of brand placement, one should focus not only its effects on explicit, but on implicit attitudes as well. The notion of measuring implicit attitudes in case of brand placements is discussed in more detailed later in this chapter.

3.2.3 Low Involvement Learning

The concept of implicit attitudes and ELM is highly connected to the concept of low involvement learning. Krugman (1965) suggested that consumers learn information from marketing communication in different manners depending on their level of involvement. Hawkins and Hoch (1992) defined two main aspects of low involvement learning. First, low involvement occurs when consumers attend to marketing communication without the explicit intention of evaluating and learning from the message. Second, the absence of explicit intentions makes sure that the message is not linked to viewers' personal needs, brand beliefs or past experiences. Research has shown that information learned under high involvement situations leads to better memory, but poor persuasion, whereas low involvement situations have a better effect on persuasion, without much of an effect on memory (Hawkins & Hoch, 1992).

Low Involvement Learning and Brand Placement

Under the definition of Hawkins and Hoch (1992), any learning process occurring when viewers are exposed to brands in the movies or programming, can be qualified as low-involvement learning. According to that, brand placements that are processed peripherally will probably have higher impact on attitudes and behavior, but will not be remembered as much as when they were perceived under conditions of high involvement.

3.2.4 Presence

The research on brand placement is grounded in the concept of “presence.” Presence is defined as a sense of being in the environment. From that definition, telepresence is the experience of presence in a reality by means of a communication

medium. The environment can be a temporally or spatially distant real environment or non-existent computer environment. Usually the term telepresence refers to any medium-induced sense of presence.

Sheridan (1992) identifies five variables that help induce a sense of telepresence. Three of them are technological in nature – the extent of sensory information, control of sensors relative to environment, and the ability to modify the physical environment. The other two are task and context-based: task difficulty and degree of automation. Determinants that influence the level of telepresence felt are vividness and interactivity. Vividness refers to the ability of a technology to produce a sensorially rich mediated environment, whereas interactivity refers to the degree to which users of a medium can influence the form or content of the mediated environment. According to Sheridan's five variables, television does not really provide much substance for telepresence, compared to any interactive environment, like video and computer games.

The concept of presence is related to the concept of media involvement, first discussed by Krugman (1965). Krugman suggested that involvement with the media strongly relates to how the persuasive messages coming through that medium gets processed. In that sense, television is really a low involvement medium and does not provide much “telepresence”, whereas computer games that require much interaction and viewers attention are high involvement and stimulate feeling of presence in viewers’.

Presence and Brand Placement

In the context of brand placement, high viewer involvement or presence with the medium may mean that they will pay less attention to the brands embedded in the programming. Research suggests that under such conditions, recall and recognition of the

placed brands will be inhibited (Grigorovici & Constantin, 2004). Using the concept of low-involvement learning in combination with the concept of involvement with the media, one can suggest that in low involvement media such as TV, brands will be remembered better than in high involvement media such as computer games; further, within each medium, low involvement with the programming or the show will lead to better persuasion and worse memory, than high involvement.

3.2.5 Mere Exposure Effect

It is known that consumers can be influenced via incidental exposure to brand names and brand identifiers even when such exposure is not motivated by attentive processing. This mere exposure effect was first noted by Zajonc (1968), who showed that “mere repeated exposure of the individual to a stimulus is a sufficient condition for the enhancement of his attitude toward it.” Further research on the mere exposure effect has found that recognition is a sufficient, but not necessary, condition for the mere exposure effect to occur (Moreland & Zajonc, 1977), and that liking occurs even in the absence of conscious processing of the attitude towards the object.

Meta-analysis of studies in the area of mere exposure suggest that mere exposure effects are larger with more complex stimuli that are presented with many other stimuli (Bornstein, 1989). It has also been proposed that mere exposure effects are larger when stimuli are perceived without awareness rather, than when they are consciously perceived (Bornstein & D’Agostino, 1992).

Mere Exposure Effect and Brand Placement

In the area of brand placement, the application of mere exposure effect means that consumers' exposure to the brand or any brand identifier in the show/movie might influence their subsequent attitudes even though viewers might not even remember seeing the brand. Moreover, the lower the attention of the viewer towards the brand the stronger the mere exposure effect will be.

In summary, the concepts discussed above and theories applied to brand placement research suggests that the most likely processing route for brand placement messages is peripheral, with low-involvement learning going on. Brand placement may elicit viewers' implicit attitudes, which can be affected just by the fact of mere exposure to the brand name or due to associations created by the brand and the movie/programming stimuli.

3.3 ADDITIONAL POSSIBLE MODEL FOR EXPLAINING BRAND PLACEMENT EFFECTIVENESS

The main reason that brand placement is associated with the peripheral route and low involvement learning, as stressed in the previous sections of this chapter, is that viewers are mainly focused on processing the information from the movie or television programming. However, this might change, if viewers' attention is specifically brought to the brand placement technique and its content. Such informing/priming of viewers about a possible persuasion attempt raises the viewers' persuasion knowledge. High persuasion knowledge might influence how information is being processed and attended to. The impact of priming about brand placement forthcoming in a certain program becomes very

important if a set of regulations that require full disclosure of any placements (monetary or in-kind) before the program is adopted. In such situations, viewers are “warned” about any placements they will be seeing, which will make the placement more noticeable and is likely to push the processing from the peripheral to the central route. The next section presents Persuasion Knowledge Model as it relates to brand placement.

3.3.1 Persuasion Knowledge Model

As discussed above, one of the theories that brand placement research could benefit from is persuasion knowledge of consumers. Persuasion Knowledge Model is focused on how people use their knowledge of persuasion motives and tactics to interpret, evaluate and respond to influence attempts from marketers (Friestad & Wright, 1994).

Consumers’ persuasion knowledge is expected to “hover in readiness” to help in the formation of valid attitudes about an influence agent or a product (Friestad & Wright, 1994). Thus, a major tenet of the persuasion knowledge model is that the readiness to accept the persuasive message (i.e., a message about a product) depends on how and whether consumers acknowledge that the message is influencing their perceptions.

Persuasion knowledge is what allows a consumer “to recognize, analyze, interpret, evaluate and remember persuasion attempts and to select and execute coping tactics believed to be effective and appropriate” (Friestad & Wright, 1994). The Persuasion Knowledge Model posits that once consumers are subjected to and recognize a persuasion attempt, they activate a large repertoire of coping tactics that enable them to:

- a) to cope with the persuasion by withdrawing their attention, but refocusing when they choose to;

- b) readily elucidate in their minds the causal chain of events surrounding the creation of persuasion message;
 - c) tolerate ambiguities of the message, such as ads that mingle persuasion tactics with helpful product information;
 - d) make qualified, conditional judgments about the agent's goals and tactics.
- (Friestad & Wright, 1994).

Friestad and Wright (1994) identify two ways in which people's beliefs about the effectiveness of a particular persuasion message is linked to its actual effectiveness. In one way, people are completely consciously aware of their reactions to the persuasion message and the effect of the persuasion message on their attitude; such reactions can be reflected in their reports about the attempt. In the other way, subjects respond to the effectiveness of a persuasive message without directly and consciously experiencing the reactions regarding the persuasion attempt. This proposition supports the fact that self-reported measures are not always able to identify the full effects of all persuasion attempts. So, using implicit measures – that do not require respondents' complete awareness of their attitudes and emotions for identifying the true effectiveness of brand placement – should shed additional light on the effects of brand placement, both when respondents are aware of the persuasive intent of the message and when they are not.

Even when respondents are somewhat aware of the persuasive intent of the message, the activation of the persuasion knowledge is not automatic. Campbell and Kirmani (2000) found that the activation of persuasion knowledge required cognitive resources and is an effortful process. Further research has shown that under the conditions of divided attention, the results of persuasion knowledge are eliminated (Williams, Fitzsimons & Block 2004). So, when limited resources are available, people do not invoke persuasion knowledge and thus do not adjust their behavior accordingly.

Persuasion Knowledge Model and Brand Placement

In case of brand placement, in usual viewing environment the attention of viewers are focused on the movie/show itself; therefore, they are unlikely to apply their knowledge of persuasion. Overall, brand placement invokes little persuasion knowledge, since consumers do not perceive it as a common way to influence their attitudes and behavior. Therefore, consumers are not likely to apply the variety of coping tactics available, or to resist the persuasion attempt. However, even low levels of persuasion knowledge will affect consumers' memory, attitudes and behavior (Ahluwalia, 2000).

Persuasion Knowledge Model predicts that when a person begins to recognize the persuasion element of brand placement, their coping tactics will get triggered and the so called "change of meaning" phenomenon takes over, which means that the consumer no longer takes away the same message as they did before recognizing the persuasion attempts of brand placement (Friestad & Wright, 1994).

3.4 PROPOSED FRAMEWORK FOR HOW BRAND PLACEMENT WORKS

Taking into consideration all the above presented models and theories that influence the way brand placement is processed, a framework for brand placement is proposed, with viewers' processing and overall effectiveness of brand placement depending on two dimensions: viewers' persuasion knowledge of the brand placement instance and prominence of the placement itself. The way the brand placement is processed will depend on which cell the placement falls under (see Table 3.1, below). Also, depending on that cell, the ways of measuring the effects of that placement will differ. For example, if the placement is subtle and viewers are not aware / reminded of

the persuasive intent behind that placement, the processing will likely go through the peripheral route. In that case, implicit measures of effectiveness are more likely to objectively detect any effects of that placement. On the other hand, if the placement is prominent, and viewers are aware/reminded of the persuasive intent in advance, then the processing is likely to go via the central route, and in such cases, self-reported measures might be the best ones to use.

This multi-process, multi-measurement approach might explain why prior to this research, no single theory or model has been able to fully explain how exactly brand placement works and why documentation of the effects of brand placement have not been satisfactory up to this point. An additional advantage of this approach is that it takes into account both the specific characteristics of each placement, as well as the viewers' perception element.

3.5 CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter provided the description of theoretical foundations of brand placement research. It also set the foundation for developing multi-process multi-measurement approach for the evaluating the effects of brand placement. This approach will be further tested via proposed three stage study. The first study evaluates the use of implicit measures, such as Strength-of-Association (SOA), in brand placement research. The second study evaluates how knowledge of the persuasive intent of brand placement affects viewers' brand-related memory, attitudes and behavior. The third study evaluates whether the effects of brand placement differ, depending on the placement prominence among viewers with knowledge of persuasion intent. The next chapter is devoted to the

methodology of the proposed research, presenting the structure of the research studies, research propositions, sample and measurements in details.

Chapter 4: *Overview of the Research Study and Research Propositions*

4.1 GENERAL PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH

The purpose of the proposed research study is twofold: First, to investigate the influence of brand placement on viewers' memory, attitude and behavior related to the placed brand by analyzing the role of viewers' involvement with the programming content, and their attitude and similarity to the character associated with placement. Second, to examine the influence of consumers' persuasion knowledge of this practice and prominence of the placement on their subsequent attitudes and behavior related to the placed brand.

This research is conducted using the traditional and alternative measures of consumer attitudes and behavior. As the literature review in Chapter 2 suggests, some of the existing measures for testing effectiveness of brand placement may not be sensitive enough to detect the true effects of this growing practice on consumers. This research proposes the use of implicit together with more traditional self-reported measures of recall, attitudes and behavior. So, the ancillary effect of this research is the advancement of the scope of the current brand placement effectiveness measures.

4.2. GENERAL PROPOSITIONS OF THE RESEARCH

The section contains an overview of the general propositions that present the overall agenda for this research project. These propositions are derived from the existing brand placement research and the theoretical foundations of brand placement reviewed in

Chapters 2 and 3. The subsequent sections on this chapter will further develop these propositions into detailed hypotheses.

A number of studies showed the effects of brand placement on viewers' memory. In particular, Vollmers and Mizerski (1994), and Babin and Carder (1998) reported that viewers were able to recall and recognize placed brands. However, top of the mind recall test, used as a measure of brand activation in consumer memory by Karrh (1994) did not reveal any difference between the brand activation in the memory of viewers' exposed to brand placement and those who were not.

Limited number of studies reported examining the effects of brand placement on viewers' brand attitudes (Babin & Carder 1996b; Karrh 1994; Vollmers 1995; Vollmers & Mizerski 1994). However, none of them reported any significant effects on viewers' brand attitudes.

Even smaller number of papers reported examining the effect of brand placement on behavior. Only those studies that employed implicit choice tests (Auty & Lewis, 2004; Law & Braun 2000), reported behavioral differences among the viewers exposed to brand placement and those who were not. No studies reported similar effects of brand placements using a traditional purchase intention instrument.

In the current state of affairs where brand placement effects on memory are not uniformly confirmed and brand attitudes and behavior effects are not clear at all, Karrh (1994) called for more extensive use of less obtrusive, "low-involvement" measures for brand placement research. In the same realm, Law and Braun (2000), cautioned that self-reported measures might misrepresent the reality of brand placement effects on viewers, as they might not be sensitive enough to pick up its subtle but yet important effects.

This study sets up to evaluate the use of implicit measures in addition to traditional self-reported measures in uncovering the effects of brand placement on memory, attitudes and behavior related to the placed brand. With that in mind, the following general research question is proposed; it will be developed into detailed hypotheses later in this chapter.

P1: Placing a brand or brand identifier in the content of mass programming influences viewers' memory, attitudes and behavior related to that brand, as determined by traditional and implicit measures.

Researchers suggest that viewers' personal connections to the programming content and to characters associated with the placement modulate how that placement affects viewers' brand-related memory, attitudes and behavior (De Lorme & Reid 1999). In particular, viewers' attitudes and ability to identify with the character (Karrh 1995a, Russel 1998) are mentioned as possible factors influencing brand placement effectiveness. Also, some studies suggest the relationship between viewers' program assessment and their brand evaluations (e.g. Rossler & Bacher, 2001).

So, overall viewers' involvement and attitude with the programming and their attitude and similarity to the placement associated character might have an effect on how brand placement affects them. Since none of the published research addressed this issue directly, the current research is set to examine how viewers' personal connections to the show – such as involvement with the program and attitudes/similarity to placement-associated character – modulates the influence of brand placement on viewers.

P2: Viewers' involvement with the specific media content within which the brand is placed influences the effects of brand placement on viewers.

P3: Viewers' attitude towards, and similarity with, the character associated with the placement influences the effects of brand placement on viewers.

Persuasion Knowledge Model proposes that when a consumer (in this case a viewer of the television programming) recognizes persuasion attempt of the message, his/her perception of that message and its influential abilities will change (Friestad and Wright, 1994). Therefore, brand-related memory, attitudes and behavior of viewers who are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement might differ from the ones that are not aware of it.

As the practice of brand placement gets more and more popular, the issue of the awareness of the persuasive intent becomes very important on two levels. The first is a more general level. There are an increasing number of articles in the popular press that reveal the details of brand placement practice in general and specific placements in particular. This makes casual viewers more prone to being familiar with the practice, making them more likely to notice placements in a given program. The second level is a show-specific level. Even though existing regulations are not clear on whether or not brand placements in the television programming should be revealed in advance of the programming, more and more shows have statements like "This program was brought to you by ...", which 'warns' viewers about the possible placements in the program. This type of 'warning' can be combined with other ways of brands connection to shows, such as listing the brands used in various episodes of television to give devoted viewers a chance to buy the items directly through the link on the program's website.

Current research is set to examine how the knowledge of the persuasive intent of the brand placement knowledge changes the potential effects of this practice. The general research question is the following

P4: Viewers' knowledge of the persuasive intent of brand placement messages will influence the way they process and are affected by brand placement messages.

Existing brand placement research has established that prominent placements have stronger effects on memory than subtle ones (Gupta & Lord; 1998, D'Astous & Chartier 2000, Law & Braun 2000). However, no similar effects have been reported for brand-related attitudes or behavior. Current research, using both implicit and self-reported measures, is determined to examine if prominent placements differ from subtle ones in their effect on viewers' brand-related attitudes and behavior.

In addition, as discussed above, viewers' knowledge of the persuasion intent of the message, may affect their feelings about the placed brand (Friestad & Wright 1994). The extent of such effect might depend on the prominence of the placement, since more prominent placements are more noticeable for viewers, thus bringing their attention to the motive of the placement. So, the following research question is proposed:

P5: Prominent and subtle brand placements differ in their ability to affect viewers' memory, attitudes and behavior, as determined by both implicit and self-reported measures. This difference will also depend on viewers' knowledge of the persuasive intent of brand placement messages.

The next section explains the reasoning for using various types of measures in order to completely examine the issues raised by the propositions presented above.

4.3. THEORETICAL EXPLANATIONS OF USING TRADITIONAL (EXPLICIT) AND IMPLICIT MEASURES FOR BRAND PLACEMENT RESEARCH

The research on various promotional techniques tends to continue the tradition in advertising research of using consumers' self-reported measures of attitude and behavior. Brand placement research is not an exception. So far, in brand placement research, effects have been measured mainly via explicit tests that make direct references to the placement event (D'Astous & Chartier, 2000; Gupta & Lord, 1994; Karrh, 1994; Morton & Friedman, 2002). Given that such research has produced little to no evidence of attitudinal or purchase intention effects (Law & Braun, 2000; Russell, 2002), the implicit assumption in the literature is that brand placements must not be as effective as regular advertisements.

More specifically, the impact of brand placement has been measured by aided and unaided recall (i.e., when participants are asked to recall all brands seen in the movie or TV show before or after being given a product category cue) and recognition (i.e., when participants are asked to judge whether they have seen the product/brand in the movie) or asked to rate their attitude towards the placed brand or probability of their buying/using the placed brand. Each of these is referred to as an "obtrusive measure" of impact, because study participants are directly asked about the episodes they have seen. All of these tests employ self-report assessments of memory and attitudes that require participants' full awareness of their attitudinal inventories and mental processes.

However, as discussed in Chapter 3, we often make decisions without full awareness of the reasons for doing so; in this case a lack of effects (as is apparently seen in brand placement studies) is not of the utmost concern (Bargh, 2002). The appeal of

brand placements to marketers will be greater if their effects could be demonstrated, but effectiveness itself is not necessarily related to the ease of demonstrating it. A measure of the changes in the way the contents of our memory produce responses without our conscious involvement may be equally, if not more, valuable than showing changes in self-reported measures – even though such subconscious changes may not be obvious (Fazio, 1990). In fact, for low-involvement choices, which are the ones we make most often, it may be especially valuable to measure changes at the subconscious level (Hawkins & Hoch, 1992).

As the review of theoretical background for brand placement shows, a number of dual process models of attitude development propose the following precept: when people have the motivation and the ability (opportunity and capability) to reason through a decision making task, they employ explicit attitudes; but when one or both of these conditions is absent, the implicit attitudes are being activated (Chaiken & Trope, 1999; Wagner, 2001). Dovidio and Fazio's (1991) dual response model suggests that even if we show a change in self-reported attitudes as a function of brand placement, if the associations stored in consumers' memories are not sufficiently strong, those recently-changed attitudes may not be invoked at the moment of purchase to direct consumers toward the brand in question. In contrast, stored associations not only play a role in less involved – or spontaneous – decisions, they also influence the way we process information more effortful (Fazio, 1990). Such associations are not measured by self-reported tests, suggesting that the current literature on brand placement has not tapped into this resource.

Implicit associations are more likely to be uncovered with implicit measures, where participants are not told to remember events but simply perform certain tasks (e.g., a word association or brand choice) that show the possible impact of brand placement on performance. The use of such measures has been suggested in order to uncover the full effects of brand placement on memory, attitudes and/or behavior by brand placement researchers (Karrh, 1995; Karrh, 1998; Law & Braun, 2000). Law and Braun (2000) argue that the use of explicit tests in the context of brand placement can be uninformative and may even misrepresent the influence of the placement. Instead, they propose the use of implicit measures as more appropriate ones. This view is supported by Karrh (1994), who specifically states that a “lower-level brand exposure like placements” should be evaluated with lower-involvement measures.

Given that explicit measures are subject to conscious and unconscious representations, the associations uncovered by implicit measures should be different (Banaji & Hardin, 1996; Greenwald et al., 1998). In other words, “implicit measures are not explicit measures without bias and they do not always assess constructs identical to those assessed by explicit measures.” (Brunel, Tietje & Greenwald, 2004). Although the two types of measures are related to each other, they stem from different information processing streams (the dual process models, as discussed above) where several factors, such as the type of object being assessed, self-presentation, or attitude elaboration, can influence the correlation between them (Nosek & Banaji, 2002, as cited in Brunel, et al., 2004).

So, using the arguments in this section, the propositions presented earlier are examined both with traditional (explicit) measures, as well as several implicit measures

that are proposed for the use in brand placement research. A three-study research project is proposed for examining these propositions with the help of explicit and implicit measures. The next section briefly describes each of the studies and research instruments.

4.4 DESCRIPTION OF THE MULTI-STUDY RESEARCH PROJECT

This section presents a description of each of the three experimental studies of this research project. Each study will have a relevant section in the subsequent chapters presenting the hypotheses, methodology, results and discussion of the results.

Study 1 – “Testing Implicit Measures for Brand Placement Research”

The first study is an initial investigation of the use of implicit measures of viewers’ brand attitudes. Strength of Association (SOA) is proposed as one of the effective ways that is sensitive enough to measure the effects of brand placement. In particular, the effects of placements on SOA and self-reported attitudes of viewers who are exposed to brand placement and those who are not are examined.

A two-condition between-participants experiment is conducted to compare the effects of brand placement on viewers’ SOAs and self-reported attitudes towards the brand. In addition, viewers’ attitude and similarity to the placement associated character, as well as viewers’ involvement with the show, are examined as possible influencing factors of viewers’ attitude change.

Figure 1: Design of Study 1

Control Group	Experimental Group
No exposure to stimulus - the show with brand placement	Exposure to stimulus – the show with brand placement
Dependent Measures: Viewers’ brand related SOAs and Self-Reported attitudes	

Study 2 – “Examining if viewers’ knowledge of persuasion intent of brand placement affects their attitude and behavior”

Study 2 - four-condition between participant experiment - builds on the findings of the previous one and continues to investigate the use of SOA and other implicit measures (such as choice test) to evaluate the effectiveness of brand placement in conditions when viewers are aware of the persuasion intent of brand placement (High Persuasion Knowledge – HPK) and when they are not. (Low Persuasion Knowledge – LPK). Additionally, for the High Persuasion Knowledge group, the type of persuasion knowledge – positive and negative is manipulated in order to test if there are any differences among the attitudes and behaviors of viewers with the positive information of practice of brand placement and those with the negative information.

Viewers in both (positive and negative) HPK groups are initially presented with the information about brand placement, followed by some positive and negative statements respectively. The viewers in LPK group were not given any information about brand placement prior to their exposure to research stimuli. The presentation of the

information about brand placement to research participants is a manipulation of their knowledge of the persuasion intent of brand placement messages.

In addition to SOA and number of self-reported measures of attitudes and behavior, implicit measure of behavior – choice test is conducted among all the participants in this study. Viewers’ recall and recognition of the placed brands serve as a measure of brand placement effects on viewers’ memory.

Overall, this study examines the effects of viewers’ persuasion knowledge on SOAs, attitudes and behavior, and how these relationships are affected by viewers’ involvement with the show and their attitude and similarity to the placement associated character.

Figure 2: Design of Study 2

Control Group	Low Persuasion Knowledge	High Persuasion Knowledge	
		<i>Positive</i>	<i>Negative</i>
No exposure to stimulus - the show with brand placement	No prior presentation of brand placement information Exposure to the stimulus show with brand placement	Prior presentation of positive brand placement information Exposure to the show with brand placement	Prior presentation of negative brand placement information Exposure to the show with brand placement
Dependent Measures: Viewers’ brand related SOAs and self-reported attitudes, Implicit Choice Test and Self-reported intentions to purchase the brand.			

Study 3 – “Evaluating the effects of persuasion knowledge and prominence of brand placement on viewers’ attitudes and behavior related to the placed brand”

Study 3 - two by three between participant experiment - builds on the findings of the previous two studies and uses implicit and self-reported measures to evaluate the effect of prominent and subtle brand placements on viewers’ memory, attitudes and behavior in conditions of viewers’ high and low persuasion knowledge.

Similar to Study 2, manipulation of viewers’ knowledge of the persuasion intent of brand placement messages was done the following way: viewers in HPK groups are initially presented with the information about brand placement prior to their exposure to research stimuli. The viewers in LPK group were not given any information about brand placement.

In addition to SOA and number of self-reported measures of attitudes and behavior, implicit measure of behavior – choice test is conducted among all the participants in this study. Viewers’ recall and recognition of the placed brands serve as a measure of brand placement effects on viewers’ memory.

Overall, this study further examines the effects of viewers’ persuasion knowledge on SOAs, attitudes and behavior; how these relationships are influenced by viewers’ involvement with the show and their attitude and similarity to the placement associated character; and whether these effects differ for subtle and prominent brand placements.

The next section develops hypotheses for each of the above-described studies. Methodology, sample and detailed description of the dependent measures for each of the studies are presented in Chapter 5. The analysis, results and discussion of the results are presented in Chapters 6 and 7.

Figure 3: Design of Study 3

	Control Group	Low Persuasion Knowledge	High Persuasion Knowledge
Prominent	No exposure to stimulus - the show with brand placement	No prior presentation of brand placement information Exposure to the show with prominent brand placement	Prior presentation of brand placement information Exposure to the show with prominent brand placement
Subtle		No prior presentation of brand placement information Exposure to the show with subtle brand placement	Prior presentation of brand placement information Exposure to the show with subtle brand placement
Dependent Measures: Viewers' brand related SOAs and self-reported attitudes, Implicit Choice Test and Self-reported intentions to purchase the brand.			

4.5 HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT FOR THE MULTI-STUDY RESEARCH PROJECT

4.5.1 Study 1 – Testing Implicit Measures for Brand Placement Research

Section 4.3 of this chapter discussed theoretical rationale for using both implicit and explicit measures for assessing the effects of brand placement. In particular, Strength of Association (SOA) is discussed as a way to measure change in viewers' implicit attitudes. Strength of Association test was developed by Lowery, Hardin and Sinclair

(2001) and measured differences in implicit attitudes. Though SOA test was initially developed for stereotyping research, it was later adapted for drug-related attitude research (Wagner, 2001). Detailed description of the measure is presented in section 5.4.1.

Fazio (1990) stated that SOA is changing via associative learning, which is the simple and direct connection in memory of an object to a descriptor (e.g., babies/good). Wagner (2001) and Wagner and Sundar (2003) suggest that ELM's peripheral processing route functions in a manner very similar to associative learning. Unlike the central route, which involves attitudes being influenced by elaboration on the arguments of the message, the peripheral route involves viewers simply connecting the attitude object at hand to peripheral cues such as a well-liked celebrity or the context in which the object is shown (Petty & Wegener, 1999).

Based on this, Wagner and Sundar (2003) suggest that a persuasive message leads to the most change of SOA when the processing of that message by the viewers is peripheral, and not central. The results of their study confirmed that participants who were exposed to anti-drug ads peripherally showed more negative drug-related SOAs compared to those who watched the ads centrally.

As argued earlier in Chapters 2 and 3, due to their nature, brand placements are more likely to be processed peripherally. In usual viewing conditions (when viewers are not specifically warned about the upcoming placements) brand placements do not present any persuasive arguments that viewers might engage in elaborating upon. So, it is possible to suggest that exposure to brand placement might lead to change in viewers'

brand related SOAs, in particular viewers that watch placement of the brand might have a higher brand related SOAs than those that are not exposed to such placement.

Use of traditional attitude measures to uncover the effects of brand placement on viewers' brand attitudes, as was detailed discussed in Chapter 2, did not bear many positive results. In particular, Babin and Carder (1996b) reported that viewing an excerpt from a movie with a specific brand placement did not change viewers' attitudes towards that brand. Their results are consistent with previous research by Vollmers (1995), Vollmers and Mizerski (1994), and Karrh (1994), who reported no significant differences between brand attitudes of participants exposed to brand placement and those who were not.

Consistent with the body of previous research, it is proposed here that while the exposure to brand placement might affect viewers' brand-related SOAs, it will not affect their self-reported brand attitudes.

H1a: Participants who view a product placement will exhibit more positive product-related SOA than those who do not view the placement.

H1b: Self-reported brand attitudes will not differ among the participants who view brand placement and those who do not.

As stated before, during the exposure to brand placements, the attention of the viewer is directed towards the movie stimuli, comprehension of a movie/show plot and development of the characters, and not towards the attributes of the product placed in the movie. In such situations, a viewer is not likely to actively seek out product information, which means that his/her attitude formation will follow the peripheral route of persuasion

(Stratton, 1992; Karrh, 1994). As a result, a viewer is not likely to counter-argue or critically evaluate any information about the brand in the movie.

As Petty and Cacioppo (1984b) suggested, when elaboration likelihood is low, message source serve as simple but effective cues for attitude formation, in this case, attitude towards the placed brand. In case of brand placement a source can be a movie character, the movie itself, or any other positive or negative stimuli associated with the movie.

This concept of source importance derived from ELM is comparable with the propositions of initial brand placement research. In his proposed framework Karrh (1998a; 1998b) discusses that brands have symbolic meaning, carrying important social information. For example, when a lead character of “Legally Blond” movie uses pink Mac™ laptop, in a class of students where everyone owns PC, it it carries certain information about that character of non-conformity and standing out. In such situation, how much the viewers likes the placement associated character, how similar he/she feels to that character and how strong his/her desire is to be like that character, influences the way that the viewer will pick up on a symbolic meaning of a brand associated with that character. Moreover, viewers’ affinity toward a placed product may be dependent upon their “desire to emulate the character” associated with the placement. A desire to emulate is theorized to depend upon character likeability and perceived similarity (see Hoffner & Cantor, 1991).

DeLorme and Reid’s (1999) extensive focus group research revealed that brands in the programming are perceived as tools for identity and aspirations. Viewers use the meaning of the brands to confirm or disconfirm identities and lifestyles of the characters

and to compare them to their own. Similarly to Karrh (1998a), the authors propose that viewer's empathy with the placement associated character might influence how that viewer is affected by the placement.

Overall, if the viewers have positive feelings about the placement associated character, associate themselves with that character, consider themselves similar to that character, it is more likely that they will be positively affected by the brand implicitly endorsed by that character. Based on the above, it may be hypothesized that the viewers' attitude towards the character and perceived similarity may affect the relationship between placement consumption and viewers' attitudes towards the placed brand for those who view a placement:

H2: Viewers' attitudes toward the placement-associated character will be related to their self-reported attitudes about the placed product.

H3: Viewers' perceived similarity to the placement-associated character will be related to their self-reported attitudes about the placed product.

An indirect test of Karrh's (1998a, 1998b) propositions would be to check these relationships with respect to brand related SOAs:

H4: Viewers' attitudes toward the placement-associated character will be related to their product-related SOA.

H5: Viewers' perceived similarity to the placement-associated character will be related to their product-related SOA.

The term involvement is generally described as an individual's relationship with some objects or set of objects, including message and media.

(Greenwald & Leavitt, 1984; Leigh & Menon 1987). Personal relevance and importance are instrumental for the concept of involvement (Krugman 1965). So, following DeLorme and Reid's (1999) proposition that the level of viewers' involvement with the specific media content can influence how brand placement is processed, it can be suggested that viewers' personal relevance, attitude and importance towards particular show affect brand placements.

Park and McClung (1986) in their research discovered a curvilinear relationship between involvement with the programming and with the ads placed within the programs; they showed that at the highest level of involvement with the program, involvement with commercials was reduced. Possible explanation of this phenomenon is that since viewers have limited attention and cognitive capacity, the more resources they allocate to the content of the program the less is left for the commercials. In this regard, brand placement is part of the programming, and the attention allocated to the show is the same level that is enjoyed by brand placement. So, the more involved the person is with the content of programming the better are the chances of brand placement to affect viewers attitudes towards the brand.

In addition, as was suggested in previous paragraphs, the show or the movie itself can be considered as source of the message. So, with respect to ELM's postulates, in conditions of low likelihood of elaboration, source serves as a cue for attitude formation and viewers' feelings towards the content where the brand was placed influences viewers' consequent attitudes toward that brand.

With that in mind it may be hypothesized that viewers' feelings towards the content where the brand is placed may be used to predict their self-reported attitudes towards the placed brand.

H6: Viewers' involvement with the content within which the brand is placed will be related to their self-reported attitudes about the placed brand.

An indirect test of this proposition is to test this relationship with respect to viewers' brand-related SOAs

H7: Viewers' involvement with the content within which the brand is placed will be related to their product-related SOA.

This study is designed as an initial step to test the use of SOA measure for uncovering the effects of brand placement on consumers' brand associations. Further studies will focus on the effects of brand placement on memory and behavior, incorporating the findings and results of this study. In particular, dependent variables other than brand associations and attitudes will be examined for possible effects of brand placement exposure.

4.5.2 Study 2 – Examining if Viewers' Knowledge of Persuasion Intent of Brand Placement Affects Their Attitude and Behavior

One of the main tasks of consumers is to interpret and evaluate the persuasive messages coming from marketers. They understand that the objective of such messages is to influence their attitudes and decision making, and throughout their market related experiences they learn to distinguish such messages and to adapt their behavior

consequently. Persuasion Knowledge Model is focused on how people use their knowledge of persuasion motives and tactics to interpret, evaluate and respond to influence attempts from marketers (Friestad & Wright, 1994).

As a consequence of consumers' knowledge of persuasion attempts, the effects of certain tactics used by persuasion agents (marketers and advertisers) to influence people's attitudes and behavior will change, because people's persuasion knowledge determines how they respond to persuasion attacks (Friestad & Wright, 1994). This mechanism is defined as "change of meaning" – i.e. the meaning that consumer takes from the communication changes upon their knowledge of persuasion intent.

This model suggests that people's persuasion knowledge is subject to personal and societal development. Usually, consumers use a socially constructed set of widely shared beliefs about fundamental aspects of the persuasion process as it occurs across the persuasion context of different aspects of life (Friestad & Wright, 1995). This widely shared set of beliefs is developed from various sources: social interactions, conversations, observations and from media and other commentary on advertising and marketing tactics.

In terms of personal development, Wright, Friestad and Boush (2005) in their review of the marketplace knowledge of children suggest that children gradually learn the intricacies of being a consumer and marketplace information. In particular, they learn to distinguish between advertising and programming content, to recognize external message source to explicit source, move from an egocentric view that all ads are directed only at them, to a general audience concept (Robertson & Rossiter 1974). In addition to that an understanding that advertisers want to sell products to make economic profits was cited

as part of child's overall socialization as a consumer (Ward, Wackman, & Wartella, 1977).

In terms of societal knowledge of persuasion, it does not necessarily consist of specific pre-stored beliefs in people's minds about all aspects of persuasion context (Friestad & Wright, 1995). When members of a culture encounter a new persuasion context, they draw upon core beliefs about the context in which the persuasion attempt is made to form their attitude towards the persuasive message. For example, when people encountered TV advertising for the first time in 50's, they probably viewed that in the realms of advocacy, since they weren't used that from the screens of their TV sets commercial persuasive messages might be delivered. But as the knowledge of television advertising increased in the society, people learned the purpose and process of television advertising, probably drawing upon their knowledge of radio and print ads (Friestad & Wright 1995).

Similarly, if people's information about brand placement techniques is not readily available, due to relative novelty and recent increased popularity, before such set of beliefs is established they would draw upon their knowledge of television or other types advertising, to make inferences about the practice of brand placement and they will adjust their behavior accordingly

With such persuasion knowledge consumers develop a set of coping techniques that they apply in various persuasion situations such as withdrawing their attention, going through causal chain of events surrounding the creation of persuasion message, making inferences about the message and the source (Friestad & Wright, 1994). One of the

common coping techniques for consumers to react to advertising messages is to discount messages recognized as ads (Obermiller, Spangenberg & MacLachlan, 2005).

Supplying viewers the information about brand placement prior to their exposure to it, can be considered “priming”. According to the meta-analysis (DeCoster & Claypool, 2004) there are three types of priming effects. Sometimes primes become incorporated in the impression of the target (assimilation), sometimes they are used as standards of comparison (anchoring), and sometimes they cause people to consciously alter their judgments (correction). In case of brand placement, increased persuasion knowledge can be expected to cause viewers correct their judgments and adjust their behavior. Person’s memory represents the total accumulation of prior learning experiences (Bettman 1979), such ‘conscious’ correction of judgment ensures that information about brand placement has an effect on viewers’ memory.

In the brand placement context, such priming – providing positive or negative information, makes viewers concentrate on the concept and being more attuned to the placements throughout the show. That doesn’t mean that such priming helps influencing viewers attitudes, but rather it makes them notice the placements. So, when viewers are made aware of the upcoming placements they are more likely to notice them and remember noticing them. The following hypotheses are proposed:

H8: Viewers who are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement will have higher unaided recall of the placed brand than those who were not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement.

H9: Viewers who are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement will remember the brand and placement details better, than those who are not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement.

High persuasion knowledge that makes viewers aware of the persuasion attempt not only affects viewers' memory, but also prepares them for such influence, by utilizing the mechanisms and strategies described in Chapter 3. The examples of the strategies used by viewers are withdrawing their attention, but refocusing when they choose to; readily elucidate in their minds the causal chain of events surrounding the creation of persuasion message (Friestad & Wright, 1994). For instance viewer might think that the reason why he is seeing "Palmolive" soap in the kitchen of the lead character is that the marketers of the brand made a deal with this show or movie producers.

Similarly to the previous hypothesis, "change of meaning" principle will ensure the difference in how brand placement affects brand attitudes and associations of people with high and low persuasion knowledge and how aware they are of such affect. So, the effects of brand placement on attitudes of these two groups should be different.

As discussed in Chapter 3, Friestad and Wright (1994) identify two ways in which people's beliefs about the effectiveness of a particular persuasive message is linked to its actual effectiveness. In one way, people are completely consciously aware of their reactions to the persuasion message and the effect of the persuasion message on their attitude; such reactions can be reflected in their reports about the attempt. In the other way, subjects respond to the effectiveness of a persuasive message without directly and consciously experiencing the reactions regarding the persuasion attempt. This supports the fact that self-reported measures are not always able to identify the full effects of all

persuasion attempts. So, using implicit measures – that do not require respondents' complete awareness of their attitudes and emotions should be better measure to employ when respondents are not aware of the persuasive intent of the message.

In particular, in Study 1, Strength of Association (SOA) was proposed as a measure of brand placement effectiveness. As discussed in Chapter 4, there is a stronger effect on SOA when viewers are not elaborating on the message (i.e., when the information is being processed peripherally) (Wagner & Sundar, 2001). In usual viewing conditions, brand placements are more likely to be processed peripherally, since viewers attention is focused mainly on the content of the programming. However, after being specifically informed/reminded about the nature of brand placement, viewers are more likely to think about the placement incident and the brand, noticing it on the screen. This is more likely to cause thoughts and elaboration about the idea, which will activate the central processing route.

Since viewers with different levels of persuasion knowledge are more likely to process brand placements via different routes to persuasion, their SOA scores are likely to be different as well. Based on this the following hypotheses are developed.

H10a: Viewers' brand related SOAs will differ depending on their exposure and knowledge of persuasion intent of brand placement, in particular, SOA of viewers that are aware of persuasion intent will be different from SOA of viewers that are not aware of persuasion intent of brand placement.

H10b: Viewers' self-reported brand attitudes will differ depending on their exposure and knowledge of persuasion intent of brand placement, in particular, brand attitudes of viewers that are aware of persuasion intent will be different

from brand attitudes of viewers that are not aware of persuasion intent of brand placement.

In Study 1, viewers' desire to emulate the placement associated character, which is a combined score of viewers' attitudes towards and perceived similarity to the placement associated character, and viewers' involvement with the show were hypothesized to predict viewers' brand related SOAs and self-reported attitudes towards the placed brand. However, awareness of the persuasive intent of brand placement is likely to change such relationships.

Viewers' beliefs and thoughts about the context where the persuasive message is placed play an important role in how consumers perceive the message (Fuchs, 1964; Dahlen, 2005) and how they activate their persuasion knowledge (Friestad & Wright 1999). The research on media source effects, propose the so-called "congruity principle" that the medium and the advertised brand converge and become more similar in consumers' minds (Fuchs, 1964; Dahlen, 2005). Similar results have been found in the research on product endorsers and match-up effects (e.g., Kamins, 1990; Solomon, Ashmore, & Longo, 1992; Till & Busler, 2000). The endorser functions as an information source (similar to a media source), and by way of associative learning, associations are transferred to the brand (Till & Busler, 2000). In the context of brand placement, the source is the show where the brand is placed and the endorser is the character associated with the placement.

Campbell and Kirmany (2000) proposed that consumers may also use their persuasion knowledge to form perceptions of the persuasion agent. The psychological state in which an individual considers that the agent (actor) may have a hidden motive for

behavior has been defined as “suspicion” (Fein, 1996). When one ‘suspects’ the underlying motives of an agent (actor), it can bring to less favorable perceptions of that agent (actor) (Fein, Hilton, & Miller, 1990). Similarly, accessing persuasion knowledge in the brand placement situation may raise viewers’ suspicion that the character’s and show’s endorsement of the brand is actually motivated by the intent to persuade, as opposed to entertainment value.

So, when they are aware of the intent of the placement, they are less likely not to transform their feelings towards the actor and the show to their feelings for the brand. However, this awareness might also cause the self-reported attitudes to capture the feelings towards the brand. When viewers are not aware of persuasive intent of brand placement, the implicit measures, such as SOAs are more effective measure in evaluating the effects of brand placement on attitudes

With this, and the hypotheses of Study 1 in mind, it may be proposed that viewers’ persuasion knowledge will influence how the above discussed variables predict viewers’ self-reported attitudes and brand-related SOAs.

H11: Viewers’ attitudes and similarity towards placement associated character, together with their attitudes and involvement with the show, are more likely to predict their self-reported attitudes towards the placed brand when viewers know about the persuasive intent of brand placement, than when they are unaware of the persuasive intent of brand placement.

H12: Viewers’ attitudes and similarity towards placement associated character, together with their attitudes and involvement with the show are more likely to predict their brand related SOAs when viewers are not aware of the persuasive

intent of brand placement, than when they know the persuasive intent of brand placement.

Law and Braun (2000) suggested that placements could work by ‘making’ consumers choose a placed brand without them being aware that they have been influenced in this manner. In this case, while consumers in the low persuasion knowledge group will be in the situation as they usually watch television shows, respondents in the high persuasion knowledge groups will be specifically attuned to and aware of the influence brand placement could have on them and are likely to apply a set of persuasion coping techniques.

People do not like being told what to think or how to feel, they resist (Haas & Grady 1975, Petty & Cacioppo 1979). As research shows, priming (or forewarning messages) can motivate people to think of counterarguments prior of the exposure of the message (Jack & Devine 2000). This is confirmed by further research by Jack and Cameroon (2003) who in their analysis of resistance to persuasion strategies used by viewers found that counterarguing was the most popular and effective persuasion coping strategies.

In context of brand placement this means that people with high persuasion knowledge will not choose the brand that the placement is ‘pushing’ on them. However, when implicit measures are used, as proposed Law and Braun (2000), viewers are likely not to demonstrate such resistance. So the following hypotheses are suggested:

H13: Viewers that are not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement are more likely to choose the brand that was placed over the competitors’ brands, than those who know about the persuasive intent of brand placement.

H14: There is going to be no difference in viewers self-reported purchase intention of the placed brand between the people who are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement and those that are not.

4.5.3 Study 3 - Evaluating the Effects of Persuasion Knowledge and Prominence of Brand Placement on Viewers' Attitudes and Behavior Related to the Placed Brand

The effect of the prominence of placement on viewers' memory was one of the first questions asked in brand placement research (Karrh, 1998; Russel, 1998; Law & Braun, 2000). With memory measures being the most popular measure of effectiveness, it has been very important to show such effects.

Karrh (1994) found that brand salience was significantly higher for the brand that was prominently displayed in the movie clip. This was confirmed by further research showing that prominently placed brands have higher recall (Brennan, Dubas & Babin, 1999; D'Astous & Chartier, 2000; Gupta & Lord, 1998), and recognition (Brennan, et al., 1999) than just background drops and/or subtle placements. In addition, Saberwahl, Pokrywczynsky and Griffin (1994) reported that subjects recalled audio-visual placements (that can be considered more prominent than just visual) more than only visual brand placements. Taking into account the hypotheses H8 and H9, where it was hypothesized that viewers aware of persuasion intent of brand placement have higher recall and recognition, than those that are not, the following is proposed:

H15: Viewers that are aware of the brand placement will mention the placed brand in the unaided recall test more often than viewers that are not aware of

brand placement, and within each group prominent placements will be mentioned more often.

H16: Viewers that are aware of the brand placement are more likely to remember the brand and the details of brand placement than viewers who are not aware of persuasive intent of brand placement and within each group the details of prominent placements will be remembered better.

Prominence of the placement might have an effect not only on memory, as was proposed in previous section, but also on brand related attitudes and associations. DeLorme and Reid (1999) and D'Astous and Chartier, (2000) suggested that viewers enjoyed subtle brand placements, because they add realism to the movie, but disliked excessive or too obvious brand exposure, because they distract from movie content.

When placements are very prominent, and viewers are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement, they are more likely to resist to persuasion attempt (Haas & Grady, 1975), and using one of the many coping techniques (Friestad & Wright, 1994) adjust their attitudes. Such awareness and resistance is likely to produce some thinking and elaborating related to persuasion act, thus ensuring more central processing of the information. In this case explicit self-reported measures of attitudes are more likely to capture the effects of brand placement.

When placements are subtle and viewers are not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placements, the processing is likely to progress peripherally. Study 2 hypothesized that brand placement produced more brand related SOA in the lower persuasion knowledge group, than in the high persuasion knowledge groups. Given that SOA measure captures viewers' reactions better when the information processing peripherally,

it can be hypothesized that subtle placements are likely to change viewers' brand related associations more than prominent ones.

H17a: Viewers' brand related SOAs will differ depending on their knowledge of persuasion intent of brand placement and prominence of the placement. In particular, SOA scores of viewers that are not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement messages will differ for subtly and prominently placed brands. Also, SOA scores of viewers that are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement will not differ for prominent and subtle placements. Overall, the people that are not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement will have higher SOA scores than those that are.

H17b: Viewers' self-reported attitudes will differ depending on their knowledge of persuasion intent of brand placement and prominence of the placement. In particular, viewers that are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement messages will have different self-reported attitudes towards prominently placed brand, from subtle placed brand; also viewers that are not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement will not differ in their self-reported attitudes towards prominent and subtle placements.

Using the concepts of Persuasion Knowledge Model and resistance to persuasion principle, discussed in Chapter 3 and preceding paragraphs, it is proposed that when viewers are not aware of the brand placement, the more prominent and visible the brand is, the more it will affect their choice of that brand. On the other hand when viewers are

aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement, then they will favor subtle over more prominent placements (DeLorme & Reid, 1999).

As the discussion in Chapter 3 showed, self-reported measure of buying intentions might be not sensitive enough to any effects of brand placement on viewers' brand choice. With this in mind the following is proposed:

H18: Prominently placed brands are more likely to be chosen over the competitors' brands by viewers that are not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement, than by viewers that are aware of such intent.

H19: Subtle placed brands are more likely to be chosen over the competitors brands by viewers that are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement, than those who are not, while explicit purchase intentions will not differ among those two groups.

This chapter presented the overview, structure and general propositions for the research project. Detailed hypotheses were developed for each of the three studies. The next chapter presents methodology of the research projects, measures and procedures.

Chapter 5: *Methodology of the Research Study*

This chapter presents comprehensive description of the methodology of the three experimental studies conducted within the framework of this research. The first study evaluated the use of implicit measures, such as Strength-of-Association (SOA), in brand placement research. The second study evaluated how knowledge of the persuasive intent of brand placement affects viewers' brand-related memory, attitudes and behavior. The third study evaluated whether the effects of brand placement differ, depending on the placement prominence among viewers with knowledge of persuasion intent.

Research sample, used stimuli and procedures used to collect the data are outlined in detail for each study. The separate section is devoted to dependent measures applied in this research.

5.1 OVERALL SAMPLE DESCRIPTION

The overall sample for this study is comprised of two hundred ninety one undergraduate students from a major university, who received an extra-credit for one of their classes in the College of Communication. All three studies used the same student population, ensuring the comparability of results among the three studies. To control for demand characteristics, the participants in all three studies are told that they are participating in a study that is evaluating the effects of media. The given explanation of the research purpose is consistent with the fact that all respondents are selected through the participants' pool in one of the departments of the College of Communication. After completion of the experimental study, all participants were debriefed about the real

purpose of study. Participants were randomly assigned to various experimental conditions, depending on the study. Random assignment ensures that discovered differences between experimental conditions are due to experimental treatments and not specific group-assignment techniques. Below are sample descriptions for three conducted studies. For more details please refer to Appendix A “Sample Description”.

5.1.1 Sample Description for Study 1

Forty-three respondents participated in Study 1. Of those 24% were males and 76% - females. Twenty participants were assigned to experimental condition, and 22 were assigned to control condition.

Based on their self-reported information, about 40% of participants watch TV less than one hour a day, 50% watch TV more than one but less than three hours a day, and about 10 % watch TV three and more hours a day.

5.1.2 Sample Description for Study 2

One hundred forty five respondents participated in Study 2. Of those about 30% were males and 70% were females. Thirty eight participants were assigned to control condition, 35 to low persuasion knowledge condition, 26 to high positive persuasion knowledge and 44 to high negative persuasion knowledge.

According to the self-reports of the participants, about 25 % of them watch TV less than one hour a day, about 58 % of them watch between one and three hours TV a day, and 17% of them watch three and more hours of television a day.

5.1.3 Sample Description for Study 3

One hundred and three respondents participated in Study 2. Of those about 37% were males and 63 % were females. Nineteen participants were assigned to the control group, another 19 to low persuasion knowledge group with prominent placement, 24 to low persuasion knowledge group with subtle placement, 20 to high persuasion knowledge group with prominent placement and twenty one to high persuasion knowledge group with subtle placement.

According to participants' self-reports, about 31% of the sample watch less than one hour of television a day, about 57% of the sample watch between one and three hours of television a day, and 12 % watch three and more hours of television a day.

5.2. RESEARCH STIMULI

Excerpts from popular television shows are used as stimuli for this study. The shows are selected based on their popularity among audiences similar to the participants. Each excerpt contains brand placement – prominent or subtle. depending on the stage of the study. For detailed transcript of the used excerpts refer to Appendix B “Stimuli”. To ensure the comparability of results across the three studies, all stimuli contain the placements of low-involvement products within the content of the episodes of a television show popular with the student audience.

5.2.1. Stimuli for Study 1 and Study 2

Research Study 1 and Study 2 used the same stimulus – a seven-minute excerpt from the television show *Friends*. The show was one of the most popular among the

sample population (Schneider & Adalian, 2003; Pursell, 2000), and the particular episode used was chosen because it had not been aired in prime-time for several years (National Broadcasting Company, 2004). The excerpt from the show includes a prominent placement of Snuggle fabric softener in a scene, both visually and verbally, and it depicts Ross, one of the show's main characters, preparing to use Snuggle while doing his laundry. The scene revolves around the question of whether Snuggle is masculine enough to impress Rachel, a female character whom Ross is attempting to court.

5.2.2 Stimulus for Study 3

Study 3 used a seven minute excerpt stimulus from television show "Friends". The excerpt contained a placement of the brand of cereal – Cocoa Puffs™. Since the research design required having two types of placement for this study – prominent and subtle, two versions – one containing a prominent and the other subtle placement of the brand were created by the means of digital editing using the Final Cut Pro 5 editing software. Prominent placement included a thirty seconds of placement of Cocoa Puffs, with the box clearly visible and taking up to 15% of the screen, while the placement-associated character, Joey is eating the cereal out of a bowl. The placement also includes a verbal mention of a Cocoa-Puffs character – bird, by Joey. In the subtle placement version, this verbal mention is eliminated. Also the exposure time is cut to 5 seconds. The brand name Cocoa Puffs is clearly visible.

5.3 PROCEDURE

5.3.1 Description of Research Procedures for Study 1

Upon arriving at any of the experimental sessions, participants were asked to draw a slip of paper that contains their identification (ID) numbers, which determined their condition assignment, from a bag that contains ID numbers for all conditions. After selecting their ID numbers, participants were escorted to separate rooms – depending upon the numbers they draw – in which the conditions are run.

Before starting, participants were asked to sign informed consent forms. This document explained their rights and responsibilities as research participants and provided the contact information of the principal investigators of the project. The copy of the Consent Form is presented in the Appendix C. After that, participants in the experimental condition watched the excerpt from the TV show after which they were asked to complete number of measures from a multi-part questionnaire. Control group participants completed the same measures simply after signing informed consent forms. All dependent measures were administered to all participants in the same order. See Appendix F for copy of multi-part questionnaire and all the measures. After completing the measures all participants were de-briefed about the real purpose of the study. For copy of the debriefing procedure and debriefing note see Appendix G.

5.3.2 Description of Research Procedures for Study 2

Similarly to the Study 1, after arrival to the research site, participants drew a slip of paper with their identification (ID) numbers which determined their condition

assignment. All conditions were run simultaneously during each study. After selecting their ID numbers, participants were escorted to various rooms in which the conditions are run.

As with the first study, in the very beginning participants were asked to sign informed consent forms, which informed them about their rights and responsibilities as research participants and provided the contact information of the principal investigators. Following this, participants in the Positive and Negative High Persuasion Knowledge conditions were given sheets of paper to read that contained information about the practice of brand placement, as well positive and negative statements about this practice respectively (Positive High Persuasion Knowledge group read the positive statements, while Negative High Persuasion Knowledge group read the negative statements). See Appendix D for copy of positive and negative statements given to participants. Participants in Low Persuasion Knowledge group did not read any statements or information about the practice of brand placement. After that, participants in all experimental conditions watched the excerpt from the TV show. In the end they were asked to complete the measures from a multi-part questionnaire. Control group participants completed the same measures simply after signing informed consent forms. As with the previous study all dependent measures were administered to all participants in the same order. Upon completing the measures all participants were de-briefed about the real purpose of the study. For copy of the debriefing procedure and debriefing note see Appendix G.

5.3.3 Description of Research Procedures for Study 3

Two days in advance, participants who were registered to participate in this research study were randomly assigned to one of the four experimental conditions or a control group. That assignment was done by using an online random number generator (www.randomizer.org). Participants were informed about the time when they were supposed to be at the experimental site via email – times were different depending on the group assignment.

Similar to previous study, all the sessions began by participants signing consent forms, which informed them about their rights and responsibilities as research participants and provided the contact information of the principal investigators. Following this, participants in the High Persuasion Knowledge conditions were given information about the practice of brand placement. Participants in Low Persuasion Knowledge group did not read any statements or information about the practice of brand placement. After that, participants in all experimental conditions watched the excerpt from the TV show containing prominent or subtle brand placement depending on the condition they were assigned in advance. Just as with the first two studies, after the stimulus exposure, all participants were asked to complete a multi-part questionnaire. Control group participants completed the same measures simply after signing informed consent forms. As with the previous studies all dependent measures were administered to all participants in the same order. Again, after completing the measures all participants were de-briefed about the real purpose of the study. For copy of the debriefing procedure and debriefing note see Appendix G.

5.4 DEPENDENT MEASURES

This section presents the description of the various dependent measures used in all three studies.

5.4.1 Brand Placements and Strength of Association (SOA)

Strength of Association test – a variation of response-latency Implicit Association Test (Greenwald, McGhee & Schwartz, 1998) in its paper and pencil form was developed by Lowery, Hardin and Sinclair (2001) and measured differences in implicit attitudes. SOA test was developed for stereotyping research, but was later adapted for use in drug-related attitude research (Wagner, 2001).

Research has shown that response latency is a better predictor of advertising effectiveness than several traditional self-reported measures of attitude (MacLachlan, Czepiel & LaBarbera, 1979). A particular type of response latency – “primed response latency measure” – is a structured implicit measure that has been demonstrated to measure differences in implicit attitudes and assess strength of association (e.g., Fazio, Sanbonmatsu, Powell, & Kardes, 1986; see Fazio & Towles-Schwen, 1999 for a review). In such measure, researchers prime participants with an attitude object (a brand) descriptor and then monitor the amount of time it takes to match subsequently presented positive and negative adjectives. A typical priming effect is that the participant’s speed of matching the words is greater when the prime is associated with the target word than when it is not (see Brunel, Tietje & Greenwald, 2004 for a review). For example, the participant might be asked to match two concepts (e.g., “soft” and “good,” or “soft” and “bad”). So, if the words “soft” and “good” are strongly associated, it would be easier and

faster for participant to respond. When “soft” and “bad” are not strongly associated, it would be harder to respond fast. Response latencies in the course of classifying target words as positive or negative in evaluation are treated as measures of automatic attitude activation. Overall, the stronger the associative network around an attitude object, the faster the attitude will be activated, even if the attitude is weak or not consciously held (Brunel, Tietje & Greenwald, 2004). Usually, priming is flexible and can use verbal or nonverbal (e.g., pictures, shapes, faces) stimuli (Tulving & Schacter, 1990).

Such response latency SOA measures are unobtrusive (see Dovidio & Fazio, 1991 and Fazio & Towles-Schwen, 1999 for reviews). Participants in studies using such measures are unaware that their attraction or avoidance tendencies are being measured. In fact, SOA does not require that they even be aware of the existence of such tendencies in their memory. Therefore, in relation to brand placement studies, SOA tests can circumvent the limitations of self-report measures that can make them insensitive to attitude change (Fazio, 1990). Moreover, due to the subtlety inherent in brand placements, the tactic may be optimal for provoking SOA change.

5.4.1.1 SOA Measure for Study 1 and Study 2

In these studies, participants’ SOAs towards the brand placed in the stimulus – Snuggle – are measured based on the respondents’ associations with Snuggle’s main product attribute – softness. A product’s main attributes play an important role in marketing communication, serving as the basis for evaluating a product because they underlie the benefits consumers seek when making a purchase (Aaker, Batra & Meyers, 1992; Belch & Belch, 1995; Kotler, 1991; Mowen, 1993). Successful marketing

strategies influence consumer evaluations in such a way that the brand name is associated with the most important attributes (Martin, 1998; Puth, Mostert, & Ewing, 1999). Such use of the brand essence – the main product benefits or attributes – in analyzing consumers’ responses to promotions has been successfully employed in prior research by academics (Kim, 2003; Quester & Farrelly, 1998) and professionals (Martin, 1998) alike.

As mentioned in the previous section, the SOA measure is based on a pencil-and-paper version of the Implicit Association Test (IAT; Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998). Similar to other variations of IAT (e.g., Dasgupta, McGhee, Greenwald & Banaji, 2000; Rudman, Greenwald, Mellot & Schwartz, 1999), it is a five-time judgment stage test. Each stage contains a list of words (judgment items) printed down the middle of a page. The participant is to evaluate each word by placing a checkmark in the appropriate column, either on the left or the right of the word. Detailed explanation of SOA measure for Study 1 and 2 and copy of the SOA packet is presented in the Appendix E.

5.4.1.2 SOA measure for Study 3

SOA measure used in Study 3 is structurally similar to SOA measure in the first two studies. In these studies, participants’ SOAs towards the brand placed in the stimulus – Cocoa Puffs – are measured based on the respondents’ associations with breakfast cereals product category. Consumers’ feelings toward product category may influence how consumers feel about the brand in particular. For example, Arias-Bolzmann, Chakraborty and Mowen (2000) stated that “consumers who are favorably predisposed toward the product category are more likely to generate evaluatively positive cognitive elaborations, which in turn will generate proportionally more positive cognitive

responses, leading to a more positive attitude towards the brand.” So consistent with the above, product category (breakfast cereals) identifiers were chosen as anchors for this study.

According to the research report on Breakfast Foods in US (Mintel Reports 2004), cereal is the most popular breakfast, with 76 % of 18-32 age group eating it for breakfast. Furthermore, the report on Breakfast Cereals in US (Mintel Reports 2005) shows that 62% of people who consumes breakfast cereals, are also likely to eat bagels. So, for this study bagels were chosen as the other anchor in examining the strength of associations for cereals product category.

5.4.2 Brand Placement and Attitude Towards the Brand

Self-reported measure of attitude toward the brand is administered in the process of the studies. The attitude measure consists of five-item semantic differential scales with positive and negative anchors (Anand & Sternthal, 1990). The anchors are Good – Bad, Like – Dislike, Pleasant – Unpleasant, Buy – Would not buy, Enjoyable – Unenjoyable. Cronbach alpha statistic showed scores on the scale to be reliable (alpha = .961).

The instructions for completing the measure were as follows: *Please rate your attitude towards the following brands by marking the spot that is most relevant to your feelings.* Participants’ scores on the five items were averaged, with equal weighting, to form a Self-Reported Attitude Index. This measure is presented within the main questionnaire in the Appendix.

5.4.3 Brand Placement and Implicit Choice Test

Memory processes that consumers are not fully aware of play a major role in influencing consumption (Krishnan & Trappey, 1999). Researchers have proposed several methods that foster the detection of non-conscious perception in marketing context. These methods both divert subjects' conscious attention away from experimental stimuli and provide a separate indication of where the subjects' attentive resources are allocated (Shapiro, MacInnis, Heckler & Perez, 1999).

In case of non-conscious processing, the following implicit measure was proposed to judge the effects of prior exposure to the advertisements. The participants were provided with a buying scenario and asked to list eight products that would be included in their consideration sets. No reference was made to an earlier viewed ad (Shapiro, MacInnis & Heckler, 1997). In the context of brand placements, it is in the nature of communication that the stimulus is peripheral and viewers' attention is not directed towards the brand; so a similar test would be appropriate to judge the effects of brand placement on viewers.

Law and Braun (2000) used this test in their study of the impact of brand placement on viewers. Without directly referencing the event of previous exposure to the placed brand (moreover, participants were told that they are participating in a different experiment), the viewers were given a choice task, where they were instructed to shop for a friend. They were presented a list of products and brands preferred by a friend and asked to mark the brands they would pick. Law and Braun (2000) called this measure an implicit memory test. However since the respondents were asked not only to retrieve the content of their implicit memories, but to act on that, making their choice among the

brands, this test may be more appropriately referred to as implicit choice test. This measure is presented within the main questionnaire in the Appendix F.

5.4.3.1 Choice Measure for Study 2

For Study 2, participants are given the following scenario and asked to answer certain questions regarding that situation. The scenario presented to participants in all groups read:

Your friends just got back from a long camping trip. As you are getting ready to visit your friend, you get a phone call from him/her asking you to stop by the store to pick up some stuff to do laundry, chips and drinks to enjoy while talking about camping. Your friend does not have any brand preference.

The respondents were asked to indicate how likely they are to pick up the following products on a seven-point scale, where 1 indicates “will not pick up at all” and 7 “will definitely pick up.” Unless they indicated that they will not pick up the product from a particular category at all, respondents were asked to choose a brand from a list of four brands for each category. The brands in the fabric softener category were Bounce, Snuggle, Downy and Suavitel, which were chosen due to their leading market position in the fabric softener category.

5.4.3.2 Choice Measure for Study 3

For Study 3, the structure of the implicit choice test remained similar to the one used in Study 2. However, to increase the implicitness of task and ensure spontaneous decision making from the participants’ side, participants’ opportunity to elaborate on the task was reduced by including an additional cognitive load. They were asked to

remember seven-digit phone number throughout completion of this measure (Miller, 1956). The opportunity to deliberate on the task was further reduced by limiting the amount of time to sixty seconds that participants were given to complete this particular measure. These procedures were implemented to mirror the conditions under which consumers are usually involved in spontaneous purchase decisions.

The scenario presented to participants in all groups read:

Your friend just got back from a two-week vacation in Europe and has invited you over to talk about the trip. Your friend has told you that he/she had emptied his/her fridge before going on the trip and has asked that you bring along some breakfast (he/she suggested milk, cereal, juice and yogurt) when you come by the next morning. Your friend does not have any brand preferences.

The respondents were asked to indicate how likely they are to pick up the following products on a seven-point scale, where 1 indicates “will not pick up at all” and 7 “will definitely pick up.” Unless they indicated that they will not pick up the product from a particular category at all, respondents were asked to choose a specific brand from a list of four brands for each category. The brands in the breakfast cereal Lucky Charms, Cheerios, Cocoa Puffs and Frosted Flakes, which were chosen due to their leading market position in the fabric softener category.

5.4.4 Memory Measures

5.4.4.1 Recall

Karrh (1994) suggested the use of the indirect measure of brand salience as a measurement for effects of brand placement on memory. In this measure, participants were asked to list the five brands that first come to mind, in the order they come to mind

in certain product categories – among the filler categories such as pizza, shampoos and laundry detergents, is the category in question – fabric softeners. This measure is presented within the main questionnaire in the Appendix F.

5.4.4.2 Recognition

The second memory measure used in this research is recognition. The recognition measurement is adopted from Law and Braun (2000). They used a scale adapted by Johnson, Foley, Suengas and Ray (1988). For this measure, participants are asked to select the brands that they have seen in the presented stimulus from a list of brand from different product categories. For every brand that they indicated they have seen, they were asked to complete the recognition test, describing a) what if anything was said about the product, b) what was done with the product, c) where was the product located, and d) what did the product look like. They were also asked about their feelings when they saw the brand. This measure is presented within the main questionnaire in the Appendix F.

5.4.5 Other Measures

Viewers' attitudes towards the character using the product were measured by using a seven-point scale, and the instructions read: Please circle the number that best represents your overall attitude toward this character (Ross for Stages 1 and 2 and Joey for Study 3).

Viewers' similarity towards the character associated with the placed product was measured by using a four-item semantic differential scale, adopted from Whittler & DiMeo, (1991). Reliability of the scores on this scale, as measured by Chronbach's alpha

is.80. The respondents were instructed to circle the number indicating how similar the character is to them.

Viewers' involvement with the show was measured using a seven-point semantic differential four item scales adopted from (Lord & Burnkrant, (1993); reliability of the scores on this scale, measured by Cronbach's alpha is .94 (in study 3) These measures are presented within the main questionnaire in the Appendix F.

5.5 DATA ANALYSIS

The collected data was coded and analyzed using the SPSS 14.0 statistical software package. Missing data was excluded case-wise for each of the measures. Details of the data analysis for each study are presented in Chapter 6 Results section for each study.

Chapter 6: *Findings of the Research Study*

This chapter presented the results of the hypotheses outlined in Chapter 4. Nineteen hypotheses are tested throughout three study research project. H1-7 were tested in Study 1, H8-14 were tested in Study 2, and the H16-19 in Study 3. Applied tests and analyses, along with the results are presented below.

6.1 STUDY 1 – TESTING IMPLICIT MEASURES FOR BRAND PLACEMENT RESEARCH

6.1.1 SOA and Self-Reported Attitudes Towards the Brand

It was hypothesized that viewers who are exposed to brand placement would have more positive product related SOAs than those who are not exposed to brand placement. To test this hypothesis, group means for product related SOA difference score index were calculated and independent sample *t*-test was conducted with the following results.

The means of product-related SOA Difference Score Index for Control group is 19 and for Experimental group is 26.81. The results of the independent sample *t*-test show that difference between SOA scores of these two groups is statistically significant. So, participants exposed to brand placements have significantly higher product-related SOAs than those who were not exposed to the stimulus [$t(39) = 3.069, p < .05$]. H1a is supported.

Similar analysis was conducted on viewers' self-reported attitudes towards the placed brand. The means of such brand attitudes are 5.11 for Control group and 5.29 for Experimental group. To test if there is difference between attitudes of viewers' exposed

to brand placement and those who were not, independent sample *t*-test was conducted. The results show that self-reported attitudes of the control group participants were not significantly different than those of participants from the experimental group [$t(40) = -405, p > .05$]. H1b is supported. Table 1 presents the summary of the test results for H1 a and H 1 b.

Table 1: Viewers' Brand-Related SOAs and Self-Reported Brand Attitudes for Control and Experimental Groups

	Group	N	Mean	SD
Self-Reported Brand Attitude	treatment	21	5.119	1.600
	control	21	5.297	1.231
SOA	treatment	21	26.81	8.340
Difference Score	control	20	19.00	7.934

6.1.2 Placement-Associated Character and Self-Reported Brand Attitude Index

It was hypothesized that viewers' attitudes toward the placement-associated character will be positively related to their self-reported attitudes toward the placement-associated character. Only scores of the experimental group were used for this test. However, a test of Pearson's correlation coefficient demonstrated that the correlation was not statistically significant ($r=.258, p > .05$). So, viewers' self-reported brand attitudes and their placement-associated character are not related.

Viewers' perceived similarity to the placement-associated character was also hypothesized to be correlated with self-reported attitudes about a placed product.

Pearson's correlation coefficient calculated for those two variables approached significance ($r = -.34$, $p = .06$). H3 is marginally supported.

Karrh (1998a, 1998b) recognizes that the desire to emulate characters through brand use is extremely important for product placement research. Based on this, viewers' desire to emulate the character was computed by combining the measures of similarity and attitude. Since both constructs were initially measured on seven-point semantic differential scales, each viewer's attitude towards placement-associated character, score was added to his/her perceived similarity to that character score, creating their Overall Desire to Emulate the Character score.

Viewers' Overall Desire to Emulate the Character score was examined to test if it could predict the Self-Reported Brand Attitude Index. However, the Pearson's r was not significant ($r = -.266$, $p > .05$) so the results indicate that Self-Reported attitudes towards the placed brand were not predicted by viewers' desire to emulate the character.

6.1.3 Placement-Associated Character and SOA

It was hypothesized that viewers' attitudes toward the placement-associated character will be related with their product-related SOA. To test this hypothesis, Pearson's correlation coefficient for SOA Difference Score Index and attitude towards the placement-associated character, Ross, was computed. The results were not statistically significant, meaning that attitude towards the placement-associated character did not predict product-related SOA ($r = -.263$, $p > .05$). Therefore H4 is not supported.

Viewers' perceived similarity to the placement-associated character was also examined for prediction of product-related SOA. Pearson's correlation coefficient

between SOA Difference Score Index and viewers' perceived similarity with placement-associated character was significant ($r = -.379$, $p < .05$). As this statistically significant correlation indicates, viewers' perceived similarity predicts product-related SOA; moreover, this correlation increases when controlling for gender effect ($r = -.6401$, $p < .05$). The results of this test support H5.

Similarly to the tests with self-reported brand attitudes, following Karrh's (1998a, 1998b) proposition viewers' desire to emulate the character was computed by combining the measures of similarity and attitude, creating their Overall Desire to Emulate the Character score. To test for significant correlations between this variable and viewers' SOA score and to see if this overall score can do a better job in predicting SOA, Pearson's r was computed on this re-calculated score. Pearson's r shows a stronger correlation between these variables ($r = -.435$, $p < .05$)*.

6.1.4 Involvement with the Program and Self-Reported Brand Attitude Index

It was hypothesized that viewers' involvement with the show would be correlated with their self-reported brand attitudes. Similar to the previous tests, Pearson's correlation coefficient was computed to test this hypothesis. However, the test did not indicate a statistically significant relationship ($r = -.246$, $p > .05$). H6 was not supported.

* Though the results indicate negative correlation between the SOA scores and viewers' attitudes, perceived similarity towards the placement associated character and involvement with the show, it can be explained with the fact that the brand is portrayed ironically in the show, as the main character Ross is teased for using fabric softener that is not masculine enough.

6.1.5 Involvement With the Program and SOA

Based on the research suggestions put forward by DeLorme and Reid (1994), it was also hypothesized that viewers' level of attachment with the show would be related to their product-related SOA. The results support H7($r = -.382$, $p < .05$)*.

Finally, multiple regression analyses were performed to test for the relationship between viewer's involvement with the show and their overall desire to emulate placement-associated character with product-related SOA. As hypothesized, both of these variables together were significant contributors to product-related SOA [$F(2,18) = 4.91$, $p < .05$, Adjusted $R^2 = .281$]. The contribution of involvement with the show to the prediction of brand-related SOAs was a bit smaller (standardized $\beta = -.405$, $p < .05$) than the contribution of desire to emulate the placement-related character (standardized $\beta = -.445$, $p < .05$).

Table 2: Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Viewers' Brand Related SOAs (N =22)

Variables	B	SE B	β
Desire To Emulate	-.879	.366	-.455*
Total Involvement with the Show	-.594	.278	-.405*

Note: $R^2 = .353$, $\Delta R^2 = .281$ ($ps < .05$)

* $p < .05$

Figure 4: Hypotheses Tested in Study 1 and Summary of Results

Hypotheses	Results
<p>H1: a) Participants who view a product placement will exhibit more positive product-related SOA than those who do not view the placement.</p> <p>b) Self-reported brand attitudes will not differ among the participants who view brand placement and those who do not.</p>	<p>Hypothesis supported. Viewers exposed to brand placement have more positive brand-related SOAs than those who are not exposed to brand placement.</p> <p>Hypothesis supported. Viewers' self-reported brand attitudes were not different among those who viewed brand placement and those who did not.</p>
H2: Viewers' attitudes toward the placement associated character will be related to their self-reported attitudes about the placed product.	Hypothesis not supported. Viewers' attitudes towards the character associated with placement are not correlated with their self-reported brand attitudes.
H 3: Viewers' perceived similarity to the placement-associated character will be related to their self-reported attitudes about the placed product.	Hypothesis is marginally supported. Viewers' perceived similarity to the placement associated character is significantly correlated with their self-reported brand attitudes.
H 4: Viewers' attitudes toward the placement-associated character will be related to their product-related SOA.	Hypothesis not supported. Viewers attitudes towards placement associated character are not significantly correlated with their product related SOAs.
H 5: Viewers' perceived similarity to the placement-associated character will be related to their product-related SOA.	Hypothesis supported. Viewers perceived similarity to the placement associated character are significantly correlated with their product related SOAs
	Desire to Emulate the Placement Associated Character is significantly correlated with their product related SOAs

Figure 4 contd.:

Hypotheses	Results
H 6: Viewers' involvement with the content within which the brand is placed will be related to their self-reported attitudes about the placed brand.	Hypothesis is not supported. Viewers' involvement with the content within which the brand is placed is not significantly related to their self-reported attitudes towards the placed brand.
H 7: Viewers' involvement with the content within which the brand is placed will be related to their product-related SOA.	Hypothesis supported. Viewers' involvement with the content within which the brand is placed is significantly related to their brand related SOAs.
	Multiple regression analysis showed that viewers' brand related SOAs can be predicted by their desire to emulate the character and their involvement with the content of the programming within brand was placed.

6.2 STUDY 2 – EXAMINING THE EFFECT OF VIEWERS' KNOWLEDGE OF PERSUASION INTENT OF BRAND PLACEMENT ON THEIR ATTITUDE AND BEHAVIOR

6.2.1 Effects of Brand Placement on Viewers' Memory

To examine the memory effects of brand placement, respondents were asked to recall brands in the category of fabric softeners. Cross-tabs were calculated to check the instances when Snuggle was mentioned as one of the top brand names that come to mind in the fabric softener category. It was hypothesized that viewers who were aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement have higher unaided recall of the placed brand than those who were not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement.

The results of cross-tabulation show that more than 70% of viewers in the High Persuasion Positive group and 64 % of viewers in the High Persuasion Negative Group

mentioned Snuggle in the unaided recall test. This compares to only 30% of viewers from the control group and 62% of viewer from the Low Persuasion Group. For detailed cross-tabulation refer to Table 3. So, more viewers from high persuasion groups than from low persuasion group remember the placed brand during unaided recall test.

To test this proposition across groups, chi-square test of independence was performed. The results indicate that the groups are significantly different from each other [$\chi^2(2, N=145)=15.5, p < .05$]. Hypothesis 8 is supported.

Table 3: Summary of Cross-Tabulation Analysis of Unaided Recall of the Placed Brand in Control and Experimental Groups (N=145)

		Unaided Recall	
		Brand Recalled	Brand not recalled
Control Group	Count	11	27
	% within Group	28.9%	71.1%
	% within Unaided Recall	13.6%	42.2%
Low Persuasion Knowledge Group	Count	22	13
	% within Group	62.9%	37.1%
	% within Unaided Recall	27.2%	20.3%
High Persuasion Knowledge Positive Group	Count	19	8
	% within Group	70.4%	29.6%
	% within Unaided Recall	23.5%	12.5%
High Persuasion Knowledge Negative Group	Count	29	16
	% within Group	64.4%	35.6%
	% within Unaided Recall	35.8%	25.0%
Total	Count	81	64
	% within Group	55.9%	44.1%
	% within Unaided Recall	100.0%	100.0%

It was also hypothesized that viewers who are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement will remember the brand and placement details better than those who were not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement.

To test how persuasion knowledge affects viewers' ability to recognize brands placed within the programming, respondents in the three experimental groups were asked to identify the brands they saw in the excerpt. Similarly to the above hypothesis it was hypothesized that viewers that are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement will remember the placement and its details better than viewers that are not aware of such intent. The results of cross-tabulation show that 77% of viewers are not aware of the brand placement intent remember the details of the placement. On the other hand, 89% of viewers from High Persuasion Knowledge Positive Group and 82 % of respondents from High Persuasion Negative Group correctly recognize the placement and its details. Table 4 presents the details of recognition test among participants from different groups.

Table 4 Summary of Cross-Tabulation Analysis of Recognition of the Placed Brand in Control and Experimental Groups (N= 107)

		Placed Brand Not Recognized	Placed Brand Recognized
Group B exposure no manipulation	Count	8	27
	% within Group	22.9%	77.1%
	% within Recognition	42.1%	30.7%
Group C - exposure positive manipulation	Count	3	24
	% within Group	11.1%	88.9%
	% within Recognition	15.8%	27.3%
Group D exposure negative manipulation	Count	8	37
	% within Group	17.8%	82.2%
	% within Recognition	42.1%	42.0%
Total	Count	19	88
	% within Group	17.8%	82.2%
	% within Recognition	100.0%	100.0%

To test whether recognition was based on feeling of familiarity or the recollection of specific details, respondents were asked to describe how the brand was portrayed. Ninety seven percent (97%) in low persuasion knowledge, 100 % in positive high persuasion knowledge groups, and 93% of negative high persuasion knowledge groups' respondents who correctly identified Snuggle as the only brand seen in the excerpt, correctly identified the situation where the brand was placed. For more details on cross-tabulation refer to Table 5.

Table 5: Summary of Cross-Tabulation Results of Recognition of Brand Placement Details in Control and Experimental groups. (N= 107)

		Details of brand placement		
		not recognized	one question answered	all questions answered
Group B exposure no manipulation	Count	1	0	33
	% within Group	2.9%	.0%	97.1%
	% within How was the product portrayed	33.3%	.0%	33.3%
Group C - exposure positive manipulation	Count	0	0	26
	% within Group	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within How was the product portrayed	.0%	.0%	26.3%
Group D exposure negative manipulation	Count	2	1	40
	% within Group	4.7%	2.3%	93.0%
	% within How was the product portrayed	66.7%	100.0%	40.4%
Total	Count	3	1	99
	% within Group	2.9%	1.0%	96.1%
	% within How was the product portrayed	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

So, as is shown, viewers among the groups differ in their recognition scores. To test this pattern Chi –Square Test is conducted. However, as the results indicate this pattern did not differ across the groups ($X^2(2, N=107) = 1.44, p > .05$). So, even though the percentage age analysis presented dictates that viewers that are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement are somewhat better in remembering the brand, the difference between the groups is not statistically significant. So H9 is not supported.

6.2.2 Effects of Viewers' Persuasion Knowledge of Brand Placement on Brand-related Strength of Association

It was hypothesized that due to brand placement exposure and persuasion knowledge manipulation, viewers who are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement will have different SOAs than those who are not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement. One-Factor Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted to test for such differences. The results indicate that the groups are differ significantly in their brand-related SOAs [$F(3,107) = 5.667, p < .05$].

Table 6 Analysis of Variance for Viewers' Brand Related SOA Scores

	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	3	278.174	5.667**
Within Groups	107	49.090	
Total	110		

** $p < .01$

To examine which groups in particular are different from each other, Dunnett's post-hoc multiple comparison test was conducted – low persuasion knowledge group – Group B- was chosen as a 'control' group to compare with the other ones. Results indicate that low persuasion knowledge group, (i.e. the group where viewers' were not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement), is significantly different from the high persuasion negative knowledge group, where viewers were exposed to some negative statements about brand placement practice. However, SOA of people who were

exposed to positive statements about brand placement are not significantly different from SOA of people that were not exposed to any statements at all.

The multiple comparisons also support the results of Study 1 which indicated that SOA's of people who are exposed to brand placement and those who are not are significantly different. The detailed tables with the ANOVA and Dunnett's test are presented in the Table 6 and 7. H10a is partially supported, showing that viewers, who were not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement, are significantly different in their SOAs from the viewers that were exposed to some negative statements about brand placement practice, but not from those that were exposed to positive statements.

Table 7: Dunnet's Post-hoc Tests for Multiple Comparisons of SOA scores in Control and Experimental Groups

(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean Difference (I-J)	SE
Group C - exposure positive manipulation	Group B exposure no manipulation	2.02	2.07
Group D exposure negative manipulation	Group B exposure no manipulation	4.13*	1.75
Group A – no exposure no manipulation	Group B exposure no manipulation	7.22*	1.81

* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

6.2.3 Effects of Viewers' Persuasion Knowledge of Brand Placement on Attitude

Towards the Brand

It was also hypothesized that self-reported attitudes will not differ among the respondents in all the groups. Similarly to the previous analysis, ANOVA was conducted and no significant difference was found [$F(3,137) = .42, p > .05$]. The results do not support the H10b hypothesis that self-reported brand attitudes are different among the

viewers who are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement and those who are not.

Table 8 presents the summary of the ANOVA analysis.

Table 8: Analysis of Variance for Viewers' Self-Reported Brand Attitudes

	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	3	17.70	.42
Within Groups	137	42.33	
Total	140		

6.2.4 Influence of the Show and Characters Associated With the Placement on Self-Reported Brand Attitudes

It was hypothesized that viewers desire to emulate placement associated character – the measure that consists of viewers' attitudes and their perceived similarity to the placement associated character - combined with their attitudes and involvement with the show will predict viewers' self-reported attitudes towards the placed brand for viewers that are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement, but not for those who are not aware of it.

Linear regression analysis for low persuasion group, high persuasion knowledge positive group and high persuasion knowledge negative group was conducted to test this hypothesis. Viewers' Overall Attitude and perceived similarity towards placement associated character, their overall attitude and involvement with the show, where the brand was placed were used as predictors. The model was computed for three different

groups – low persuasion group, high persuasion positive group and high persuasion negative group. For details refer to the Table 9.

For low persuasion knowledge group the chosen variables did not significantly predict viewers self-reported attitudes towards the brand [$F(4,27) = .47$, $p > .05$, Adjusted $R^2 = -.07$].

For high persuasion positive knowledge group viewers' attitudes and their perceived similarity to the placement associated character, combined with their attitudes and involvement with the show are able to predict viewers' self reported attitudes [$F(4,21) = 5.46$, $p < .05$), Adjusted $R^2 = .416$]. Details are presented in Table 10.

For high persuasion negative knowledge group the chosen variables did not significantly predict viewers self-reported attitudes towards the brand [$F(4,38) = 1.63$, $p > .05$), Adjusted $R^2 = .06$]. Details are presented in Table 11.

Table 9: Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Viewers' Self-Reported Brand Attitudes in Low Persuasion Knowledge Group (N =35)

Variables	B	SE B	β
Involvement with the show	.62	1.34	.128
Attitude towards the character	.12	.235	.126
Perceived similarity to the character	-1.13	.883	-.313
Attitude towards the show	-.02	.239	-.016

Note: $R^2 = .06$, $\Delta R^2 = -.07$ $ps > .05$

* $p < .05$

Table 10: Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Viewers' Self-Reported Brand Attitudes in High Persuasion Knowledge Positive Group (N =26)

Variables	B	SE B	β
Attitude towards the show	2.31	1.11	.50
Involvement with the show	.18	.16	.22
Attitude towards the character	.45	.75	.12
Perceived similarity to the character	-.16	.20	-.13

Note: $R^2 = .51$, $\Delta R^2 = .42$ ps < .05

* p < .05

Table 11: Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Viewers' Self-Reported Brand Attitudes in High Persuasion Knowledge Negative Group (N =44)

Variables	B	SE B	β
Involvement with the show	1.71	1.22	.28
Attitude towards the character	-.24	.18	-.24
Perceived similarity to the character	1.02	.78	.25
Attitude towards the show	-.09	.20	-.07

Note: $R^2 = .15$, $\Delta R^2 = .06$ ps > .05

* p < .05

So, to summarize, viewers' attitudes and their perceived similarity to the placement associated character, combined with their attitudes and involvement with the show can predict viewers' self-reported attitudes towards the placed brand when viewers are have positive information about persuasive intent of brand placement, prior to the exposure. H11 is partially supported.

6.2.5 Influence of the Show and Characters Associated With the Placement on SOA

It was hypothesized that similar set of variables which was used to predict viewers' self-reported attitudes can be used to predict viewers' brand related SOAs. Similar to the previous hypothesis, linear regression analysis for all three groups was conducted and Viewers' Overall Attitude towards Ross – placement associated character, their perceived similarity to Ross, their overall attitude and involvement with the show, where the brand was placed were used as predictors of SOA.

However, as the analysis shown these variables were not significant predictors of viewers' brand related SOAs. (In low persuasion knowledge group $F(4, 24) = 1.56$, $p > .05$), in high persuasion positive knowledge group $F(4,13) = .82$, $p > .05$, for high persuasion negative knowledge group $F(4,26) = .46$, $p > .05$. Detailed results of the regression analysis for all the groups are presented in Tables 12 – 14.

Table 12: Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Viewers' Brand Related SOAs in Low Persuasion Knowledge Group (N =35)

Variables	B	SE B	B
Involvement with the show	1.425	1.279	.300
Attitude towards the character	.044	.238	.047
Perceived similarity to the character	-.291	.855	-.082
Attitude towards the show	-.481	.239	-.375

Note: $R^2 = .21$, $\Delta R^2 = .07$ $ps > .05$

* $p < .05$

Table 13: Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Viewers' Brand Related SOAs in High Persuasion Knowledge Positive Group (N =26)

Variables	B	SE B	B
Involvement with the show	1.310	2.315	.223
Attitude towards the character	.237	.317	.230
Perceived similarity to the character	.139	1.566	.030
Attitude towards the show	.115	.457	.067

Note: $R^2 = .202$, $\Delta R^2 = -.044$ ps > .05

* p < .05

Table 14: Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Viewers' Brand Related SOAs in High Persuasion Knowledge Negative Group (N =44)

Variables	B	SE B	β
Involvement with the show	.143	1.683	.022
Attitude towards the character	.073	.245	.066
Perceived similarity to the character	1.011	1.122	.212
Attitude towards the show	-.080	.254	-.063

Note: $R^2 = .067$, $\Delta R^2 = -.076$ ps > .05

* p < .05

Further analysis modified a set of variables that may be used in predicting viewers' brand-related SOAs to fully incorporate any possible character influences on viewers' brand related SOAs, without limiting it to just one character associated with the placement. To the subset of the predictors specifically viewers' perceived similarity towards placement associated character, three other predictors were added including perceived similarity to Chandler and Rachel (two other characters that are present/important in the placement scene) and viewers' overall attitude towards Chandler (character who is talking to Ross – placement associated character while the product is shown and discussed). Using this set of predictors, linear regression analysis was

conducted in order to examine the prediction of viewers' brand related SOAs. The results are the following:

Results indicate that for low persuasion knowledge group, the above mentioned variables were significant predictors for determining viewers brand related SOA [$F(5.23) = 4.99$, $p < .05$, Adjusted $R^2 = .417$].

Results of the regression analysis for high persuasion positive and negative knowledge groups respectively indicate that viewers' attitude towards the show, placement associated characters and their perceived similarity to such characters were significant predictors of viewers' brand related SOAs when viewers are not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement [$F(5, 21) = 1.47$, $p > .05$ and $F(5.25) = 1.72$, $p > .05$]. Details of the regression analyses are presented in Tables 15 – 17. H12 was not supported.

Table 15: Summary of Regression Analysis for Character Related Variables, Predicting Viewers' Brand Related SOAs in Low Persuasion Knowledge Group (N =35)

Variables	B	SE B	β
Perceived Similarity to Character 1	-.771	.958	-.162
Attitude towards Character 2	-1.561	.355	-1.216*
Perceived Similarity to Character 2	2.473	1.130	.487*
Perceived Similarity to Character 3	.495	.288	.406

Note: $R^2 = .521$, $\Delta R^2 = .417$ ps < .05

* P < .05

Table 16: Summary of Regression Analysis for Character Related Variables, Predicting Viewers' Brand Related SOAs in High Persuasion Knowledge Positive Group (N =26)

Variables	B	SE B	β
Perceived Similarity to Character 1	.021	.716	.012
Attitude towards Character 2	3.324	1.886	.454
Perceived Similarity to Character 2	.138	.644	.088
Perceived Similarity to Character 3	.375	.304	.319
Attitude towards the show	.441	1.733	.075

Note: $R^2 = .383$, $\Delta R^2 = .125$ ps > .05

* P < .05

Table17: Summary of Regression Analysis for Character Related Variables, Predicting Viewers' Brand Related SOAs in High Persuasion Knowledge Negative Group (N =44)

Variables	B	SE B	β
Perceived Similarity to Character 1	-.788	.367	-.618*
Attitude towards Character 2	1.200	1.325	.232
Perceived Similarity to Character 2	.810	.366	.632*
Perceived Similarity to Character 3	.118	.280	.118
Attitude towards the show	-.194	1.348	-.030

Note: $R^2 = .256$, $\Delta R^2 = .107$ ps > .05

* P < .05

6.2.6 Behavior Test - Choice

It was hypothesized that viewers who are not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement will choose the placed brand among the competitors' brand more than those who are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement.

As the results of the cross-tabulation show, 37% and 38% of the participants in high persuasion positive and negative knowledge groups, picked the placed brand among the competitors brand. This compares to 34% of the people, from low persuasion knowledge group and 21 % of the people from the control group.

From the simple cross-tabulation analysis it was clear that the direction of the group differences is the opposite of the hypothesized one, Chi-square analysis was conducted to test the existing differences in the rate at which participants from various groups picked the brand is statistically significant. The results indicated that there was no statistically significant differences between the rate of the choice of placed brand among people who are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement and those who are not [X^2 (3, N=145) = 3.15, $p > .05$]. Detailed results of cross-tabulation are presented in Table 18. H 13 is not supported.

Table 18: Summary of Results of Cross-Tabulation Analysis of Viewers' Choice of the Placed Brand in Control and Experimental Groups (N=145)

		Placed Brand Was Not Chosen	Placed Brand Was Chosen
Control Group	Count	30	8
	% within Group	78.9%	21.1%
	% within Choice of the placed brand	30.6%	17.0%
Low Persuasion Knowledge	Count	23	12
	% within Group	65.7%	34.3%
	% within Choice of the placed brand	23.5%	25.5%
High Persuasion Knowledge Positive	Count	17	10
	% within Group	63.0%	37.0%
	% within Choice of the placed brand	17.3%	21.3%
High Persuasion Knowledge Negative	Count	28	17
	% within Group	62.2%	37.8%
	% within Choice of the placed brand	28.6%	36.2%
Total	Count	98	47
	% within Group	67.6%	32.4%
	% within Choice of the placed brand	100.0%	100.0%

6.2.7 Behavior Test - Buying Intentions

It was hypothesized that viewers' that are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement will not differ in their reported purchase intentions of the placed brands from those that are not aware of such intent.

ANOVA was conducted to examine the existing differences in buying intentions among the people aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement and those who were not. The results supported the hypothesis that explicit buying intentions do not significantly differ between the viewers that are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement and those that are not aware of such intent [$F(3, 136) = 3.54, p > .05$]. Hypothesis H 14 is supported.

Table 19: Analysis of Variance for Viewers' Self-Reported Buying Intentions in Control and Experimental Groups

	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	3	3.539	.585
Within Groups	136	6.049	
Total	139		

** $p < .01$

Figure 5: Hypotheses Tested in Study 2 and Summary of Results

Hypotheses	Results
H 8: Viewers who were aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement will have higher unaided recall of the placed brand than those who are not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement.	The hypothesis is supported showing that viewers that are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement have higher unaided recall of the placed brand than those who are not aware of such persuasive intent.
H 9: Viewers who are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement will remember the brand and placement details better, than those who are not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement.	Hypothesis is not supported. Viewers that are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement do not differ in their recognition of the brand and details of the placement from those viewers that are not aware of such persuasive intent.
H 10: a) Viewers' brand related SOAs will differ depending on their exposure and knowledge of persuasion intent of brand placement, in particular, SOA of viewers that are aware of persuasion intent will be different from SOA of viewers that are not aware of persuasion intent of brand placement. b) Viewers' self-reported brand attitudes will differ depending on their exposure and knowledge of persuasion intent of brand placement, in particular, brand attitudes of viewers that are aware of persuasion intent will be different from brand attitudes of viewers that are not aware of persuasion intent of brand placement.	Hypothesis is partially supported. The brand related SOAs of viewers that are not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement are significantly different from the SOAs of viewers that are exposed to negative information about brand placement. Hypothesis not supported. Viewers' self-reported attitudes are not different among viewers in control and any of the experimental group.

Figure 5 contd.:

Hypotheses	Results
<p>H 11: Viewers' attitudes and similarity towards placement associated character, together with their attitudes and involvement with the show, are more likely to predict their self reported attitudes towards the placed brand when viewers know about the persuasive intent of brand placement, than when they are unaware of the persuasive intent of brand placement.</p>	<p>Hypothesis is partially supported. Viewers' attitudes and similarity towards placement associated character, together with viewers' attitudes and involvement with the show can predict viewers' self-reported attitudes towards the show when viewers are presented with the positive information about persuasive intent of brand placement prior to the show.</p>
<p>H 12: Viewers' attitudes and similarity towards placement associated character, together with their attitudes and involvement with the show are more likely to predict their brand related SOAs when viewers are not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement, than when they know the persuasive intent of brand placement.</p>	<p>Hypothesis is not supported. The proposed set of variables was not able to predict viewers brand related SOAs. A new set of predictors that include – viewers' attitude towards the show, viewers attitudes and perceived similarity to all characters that are in some extent associated with the scene where the brand is placed – can be used to predict viewers brand related SOAs when viewers are not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement.</p>
<p>H 13: Viewers that are not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement are more likely to choose the brand that was placed over the competitors' brands, than those who know about the persuasive intent of brand placement.</p>	<p>Hypothesis is not supported. There is no significant difference in rate of the choosing the placed brand among the competitors' between the people who are aware about the persuasive intent of brand placement and those who were not.</p>
<p>H 14: There is going to be no difference in viewers self-reported purchase intention of the placed brand between the people who are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement and those that are not.</p>	<p>Hypothesis is supported. There are no significant differences between reported purchase intentions for the placed brand among the viewers who are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement and those who are not.</p>

6.3 STUDY 3 – EXAMINING THE EFFECTS OF PERSUASION KNOWLEDGE AND PROMINENCE OF BRAND PLACEMENT ON VIEWERS’ ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOR RELATED TO THE PLACED BRAND

Hypotheses 15 through 19 are tested in the Study 3.

6.3.1 Effects of Brand Placement on Viewers’ Unaided Recall of the Placed Brand

It was hypothesized that viewers that are aware of the brand placement will mention the placed brand in the unaided recall test more often than viewers that are not aware of brand placement and within each group prominent placements will be mentioned more often.

To test this hypothesis, cross-tabulation was used to describe instances where placed brand was mentioned in the unaided recall test. The results show that 21% and 25% of viewers’ that are not aware of persuasive intent of brand placement but were exposed to prominent and subtle placements respectively, mentioned the placed brand in their unaided recall, comparing to 70% and 68 % of viewers who were made aware of such intent and were exposed to prominent and subtle placements respectively.

Within the low persuasion group viewers exposed to subtle placement mentioned the placed brand more often than the ones that were exposed to prominent placements (25% vs. 21%), whereas the in high persuasion group. Viewers in high persuasive knowledge group that were exposed to subtle placements include the placed brand at a slightly lower rate than the ones that were exposed to prominent placements (68% vs. 70%).

To test whether there were the differences between control, high and low persuasion knowledge groups, a Chi-square test of independence was conducted. The results indicate that viewers in high persuasion knowledge group are more likely to include the placed brand in unaided recall test [X^2 (4, N=104,) = 22.4, $p < .05$] H 15 is partially supported. For more details on cross-tabulation and chi-square refer to Table 20.

Table 20: Summary of Cross-tabulation Analysis of Unaided Recall of the Placed Brand in Experimental groups (N= 102)

		Unaided Recall	
		Brand Recalled	Brand not recalled
Control Group	Count	4	15
	% within Group	21.1%	78.9%
	% within Unaided Recall	9.3%	24.6%
Low Persuasion Knowledge Group with Prominent Placement	Count	4	15
	% within Group	21.1%	78.9%
	% within Unaided Recall	9.3%	24.6%
Low Persuasion Knowledge Group with Subtle Placement	Count	6	18
	% within Group	25.0%	75.0%
	% within Unaided Recall	14.0%	29.5%
High Persuasion Knowledge Group with Prominent Placement	Count	14	6
	% within Group	70.0%	30.0%
	% within Unaided Recall	32.6%	9.8%
High Persuasion Knowledge Group with Subtle Placement	Count	15	7
	% within Group	68.2%	31.8%
	% within Unaided Recall	34.9%	11.5%
Total	Count	43	61
	% within Group	58.7%	41.3%
	% within Unaided Recall	100.0%	100.0%

6.3.2 Effects of Brand Placement on Viewers' Recognition of the Placed Brand

It was hypothesized that viewers that are aware of persuasive intent of brand placement are more likely to remember the placement and the details of brand placement than those who are not aware of such intent and within each group the details of prominent placement will be remembered better. To test this hypothesis, respondents in all experimental groups were asked to identify the brands they saw in the excerpt. The results of a cross tabulation indicate that about 84% and 87% of viewers in a low persuasion group that were exposed to prominent and subtle brand placements respectively can correctly identify the brand they saw in the excerpt, comparing to 85% and 96% of respondents who were aware of the brand placement and were exposed to prominent and subtle placements.

In addition it was hypothesized that in both groups prominent placement will outperform subtle one in how well viewers can recognize such placements. However, the cross-tabulation results indicate that only in high persuasion group prominent placements were slightly better recognized than subtle (96% vs. 95%). Table 21 presents the details for cross-tabulation analysis.

Table 21: Summary of Cross-Tabulation Analysis of Recognition of the Placed Brand in Experimental Groups (N=85)

		Placed Brand Not Recognized	Placed Brand Recognized
Low Persuasion Knowledge Group with Prominent Placement	Count	3	16
	% within Group	15.8%	84.2%
	% within Recognition	37.5%	20.8%
Low Persuasion Knowledge Group with Subtle Placement	Count	3	21
	% within Group	12.5%	87.5%
	% within Recognition	37.5%	27.3%
High Persuasion Knowledge Group with Prominent Placement	Count	1	19
	% within Group	5.0%	95.0%
	% within Recognition	12.5%	24.7%
High Persuasion Knowledge Group with Subtle Placement	Count	1	21
	% within Group	4.5%	95.5%
	% within Recognition	12.5%	27.3%
Total	Count	8	77
	% within Group	9.4%	90.6%
	% within Recognition	100.0%	100.0%

To test whether recognition was based on feeling of familiarity or the recollection of specific details, respondents were asked to describe how the brand was portrayed. From those viewers who correctly identified the brand placed in excerpt, 100% of respondents from prominent and subtle low persuasion groups and subtle high persuasion group were able to correctly identify the situation where the brand is placed. Ninety five percent of viewers in the high persuasion prominent group correctly described the situation where the brand was placed.

A Chi square test of independence was conducted to test the difference in recognition score among the groups. The results indicated that viewers that were aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement and those who are not, do not differ significantly in their recognition of the placed brand [$X^2 (3, N= 85) = 2.24, p > .05$]. So, hypothesis H 16 was not supported. For details on cross-tabulation on viewers' recognition test refer to Table 22.

Table 22: Summary of Cross-Tabulation Analysis of Recognition of Brand Placement Details in Experimental Groups (Group N=85)

		Details of brand placement		
		not recognized	one question answered	all questions answered
Low Persuasion Knowledge Group with Prominent Placement	Count	3	0	16
	% within Group	15.8%	0%	84.2%
Low Persuasion Knowledge Group with Subtle Placement	Count	2	0	8
	% within Group	20.0%	0%	80.0%
High Persuasion Knowledge Group with Prominent Placement	Count	1	0	19
	% within Group	5.0%	0%	95.0%
High Persuasion Knowledge Group with Subtle Placement	Count	1	1	20
	% within Group	4.5%	4.5%	90.9%
Total	Count	7	1	63
	% within Group	9.9%	1.4%	88.7%

6.3.3 Effects of Viewers' Persuasion Knowledge and Prominence of Brand

Placement on Brand-Related Strength of Association

It was hypothesized that viewers' brand related SOAs will differ depending on persuasion knowledge and prominence of the placement. In particular, SOA of viewers who are not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement will differ among

prominent and subtle placement groups; whereas SOA of people aware of the core intent of brand placement will not differ depending from prominence of placement.

One way ANOVA, followed by a set of orthogonal comparisons was conducted to test this hypothesis. The following three orthogonal comparisons were considered: 1) In Low Persuasion Knowledge Group SOAs for Subtle placement are compared to SOAs for Prominent Placement, 2) in High Persuasion Knowledge group SOAs for Prominent Placement are compared to SOA for Subtle placement, 3) the average of SOAs for High Persuasion are compared to the average of SOAs for Low Persuasion Knowledge Groups. Results indicate that indeed the groups differed significantly in their SOA scores [$F(3,81)=4.049$, $p < .01$]. Results of orthogonal comparisons showed that for people in low persuasion knowledge group, i.e. those that were not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement, prominence of the placement leads to significant differences in SOA scores [$t(81) = 2.534$, $p < .01$]. In contrast, for those that are aware of the intent of brand placement, prominence of the placement does not leads to significant differences in SOA scores, [$t(81)=.513$, $p > .05$].

It was also hypothesized that the average of SOA scores of people that are not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement will be higher than the average SOA scores of those that are. The third orthogonal comparison supported hypothesis 17a [$t(81)=2.553$, $p < .05$].

Detailed results of ANOVA analysis, tables of contrast coefficients and orthogonal comparisons are presented in Table 23 a-c.

Table 23: a) Analysis of Variance for Brand Related SOA Scores and Set of Orthogonal Comparisons Among Control and Experimental Groups

	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	3	176.514	4.049**
Within Groups	81	43.590	
Total	84		

**p < .01

b) Contrast Coefficients

Contrast	LP Prominent	LP Subtle	HP prominent	HP Subtle
1	1	-1	0	0
2	0	0	1	-1
3	1	1	-1	-1

c) Contrast Tests

	Contrast	df	Value of Contrast	SE	t
Assume equal variances	1	81	5.14	2.027	2.534*
	2	81	-1.05	2.040	-.513
	3	81	7.34	2.876	2.553*
Does not assume equal variances	1	40.998	5.14	2.088	2.460*
	2	39.866	-1.05	1.895	-.552
	3	80.316	7.34	2.820	2.604*

p < .05

6.3.4 Effects of Viewers' Persuasion Knowledge and Prominence of Brand

Placement on Viewers' Self-Reported Brand Attitudes

Based on the results of the previous two studies it was hypothesized that viewers that are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement messages will have different self reported attitudes towards prominently placed brand, from subtly placed brand,

whereas viewers who are not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement will not differ in their self-reported attitudes towards prominent and subtle placements.

Similarly to the previous hypothesis, one way ANOVA, followed with a set of orthogonal comparisons were conducted. 1) In Low Persuasion Knowledge Group Brand Attitudes for Subtle placement are compared to brand attitudes for Prominent Placement, 2) in High Persuasion Knowledge group brand attitudes for Prominent Placement are compared to brand attitudes for Subtle placement. The results indicated that the aforementioned groups do not differ significantly from each other in their SOA scores [$F(3;81) = .259, p > .05$].

Detailed results of ANOVA analysis, tables of contrast coefficients and orthogonal comparisons are presented in Table 24 a-c. Hypothesis 17b is not supported.

Table 24: a) Analysis of Variance for Viewers' Self-Reported Brand Attitudes and Set of Orthogonal Comparisons Among Control and Experimental Groups

	df	Mean Square	F
Between Groups	3	.259	.069
Within Groups	81	3.770	
Total	84		

b) Contrast Coefficients

Contrast	LP Prominent	LP Subtle	HP prominent	HP Subtle
1	1	-1	0	0
2	0	0	1	-1

Table 24 contd.:

c) Contrast Tests

	Contrast	Value of Contrast	Df	SE	t
Assume equal variances	1	-.1974	81	.59622	-.331
	2	-.1000	81	.59986	-.167
Does not assume equal variances	1	-.1974	38.508	.55629	-.355
	2	-.1000	38.775	.64180	-.156

6.3.5 Behavior Test - Choice and Buying Intentions

It was hypothesized that prominently placed brands are more likely to be picked over the competitors' brands by viewers that are not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement, than by viewers that are aware of such intent. On the other hand the next hypothesis suggested that subtly placed brands are more likely to be chosen over competitors' brands by viewers that are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement, than by those who are not.

Cross-tabulation was computed to see if indeed prominently placed brands are more likely to be picked over the competitors' brands by people not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement. As the results of the cross-tabulation indicate, 42% of the participants in low persuasion knowledge group and 10% of people in high persuasion knowledge group picked the placed brand over the competitors' products. Details of cross-tabulation analysis are presented in Table 25. A Chi square of independence test was conducted to see if this difference is statistically significant. The results indicate that the difference in how often the prominently placed brands are picked by viewers who are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement and those who are

not, is statistically significant [$X^2 (1, N=38) = 4.88, p < .05$]. Hypothesis 18 is supported, indicating that prominently placed brands are more likely to be chosen over the competitors' brands by people who are not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement.

Table 25: Summary of Cross-Tabulation Analysis of Viewers' Choice of Prominently Placed Brand in Low and High Persuasion Knowledge Group (N=38)

		Placed Brand Was Not Chosen	Placed Brand Was Chosen
Low Persuasion Knowledge Prominent Placement	Count	11	8
	% within Group	57.9%	42.1%
	% within the choice of the placed brand	39.3%	80.0%
High Persuasion Knowledge Prominent Placement	Count	17	2
	% within the Group	89.5%	10.5%
	% within the choice of the placed brand	60.7%	20.0%
Total	Count	28	10
	% within the Group	73.7%	26.3%
	% within the choice of the placed brand	100.0%	100.0%

Similar to the previous hypothesis, cross-tabulation was conducted to see if subtly placed brands are more likely to be picked by people who are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement, than by those who are not.

The results of cross tabulation indicate that 21 % of participants in low persuasion knowledge group picked the subtly placed brand, whereas none of the people in the high persuasion knowledge group choose the placed brand of cereal. Details of cross-

tabulation analysis are presented in Table 26. Here again, a Chi-square test of independence was computed to test this difference. The resulting X^2 was significant [$X^2(1) = 4.92, p < .05$]. Hypothesis 19 is supported, indicating that subtly placed brands are significantly likely to be picked by people who are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement than by those who are not.

Table 26: Summary of Cross-Tabulation Analysis of Viewers' Choice of the Subtly Placed Brand in Low and High Persuasion Knowledge Groups (N=45)

		Placed Brand Was Not Chosen	Placed Brand Was Chosen
Low Persuasion Knowledge Subtle Placement	Count	19	5
	% within Group	79.2%	20.8%
	% within the choice of the placed brand	47.5%	100.0%
High Persuasion Knowledge Subtle Placement	Count	21	0
	% within Group	100.0%	.0%
	% within the choice of the placed brand	52.5%	.0%
Total	Count	40	5
	% within Group	88.9%	11.1%
	% within the choice of the placed brand	100.0%	100.0%

Figure 6: Hypotheses Tested in Study 3 and Summary of Results

Hypotheses	Results
H 15: Viewers that are aware of the brand placement will mention the placed brand in the unaided recall test more often than viewers that are not aware of brand placement and within each group prominent placements will be mentioned more often.	Hypothesis is partially supported. Viewers who are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement are more likely to mention the placed brand in unaided recall test, than viewers in a low persuasive knowledge group. However, exposure to either prominent or subtle placements did not change the viewers' inclusion of the placed brand in the unaided recall test.
H 16: Viewers that are aware of the brand placement are more likely to remember the brand and the details of brand placement than viewers who are not aware of persuasive intent of brand placement and within each group the details of prominent placements will be remembered better.	Hypothesis is not supported. There are no significant differences at how likely viewers from high and low persuasion knowledge groups will remember the placement and its details. Exposure to prominent or subtle also does not make difference in viewers' recognition scores.
H 17 a) Viewers' brand related SOAs will differ depending on their knowledge of persuasion intent of brand placement and prominence of the placement. In particular, SOA scores of viewers that are not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement messages will differ for subtly and prominently placed brands. Also, SOA scores of viewers that are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement will not differ for prominent and subtle placements; overall, the people that are not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement will have higher SOA scores than those that are.	Hypothesis is supported. Viewers that are not aware of persuasive intent of brand placement have different SOA scores for subtly and prominently placed brands. However, then viewers are aware of such an intent, their SOA scores do not differ depending on the prominence of the placement. Overall, it was supported that SOA scores of people that are not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement are more affected by brand placement, than SOAs of those that are aware of such intent.

Figure 6 contd:

Hypotheses	Results
<p>H 17 b) Viewers' self-reported attitudes will differ depending on their knowledge of persuasion intent of brand placement and prominence of the placement. In particular, viewers that are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement messages will have different self-reported attitudes towards prominently placed brand, from subtle placed brand; also viewers that are not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement will not differ in their self-reported attitudes towards prominent and subtle placements.</p>	<p>Hypothesis is partially supported. Viewers' self-reported attitudes do not differ significantly for subtle and prominently placed brands among the viewers that are both aware and not aware of the intent of the brand placement.</p>
<p>H 18: Prominently placed brands are more likely to be chosen over the competitors' brands by viewers that are not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement, than by viewers that are aware of such intent.</p>	<p>Hypothesis is supported, showing that prominently placed brands are more likely to be picked over the competitors' brands by people that are not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement.</p>
<p>H 19: Subtle placed brands are more likely to be chosen over the competitors brands by viewers that are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement, than those who are not, while explicit purchase intentions will not differ among those two groups.</p>	<p>Hypothesis 19 is supported, showing that subtly placed brands are more likely to be picked by people that are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement than by those that are not</p>

The next chapter discusses the results of the three studies presented here and presents possible explanations for such results. It also provides a discussion of the limitations of this research and its possible future extensions.

Chapter 7: *Discussion of the Results of the Three Studies, Conclusions and Contributions*

This chapter presents general discussion of the results from the three studies described in the previous chapters, contributions of this research to brand placement research, its limitations and propositions for methodological and further extension of this research.

The purpose of this research was twofold: to investigate influence of brand placement on memory, attitude and behavior related to the placed brand by analyzing the role of viewers' involvement with the programming content, and their attitude and similarity to the character associated with placement and to examine the influence of placement prominence and consumers' knowledge of persuasion intent of this practice on their subsequent attitudes and behavior related to the placed brand.

7.1 DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS OF STUDY 1

The findings presented in previous chapter suggest that although brand placement might not have an effect on self-reported attitudes towards the brand, it can change consumers' brand-related SOAs. The results also suggest that self-reported attitudes might not be sensitive enough to capture the effects of brand placement, which explains why the prior research did not detect the effects of brand placement on viewers' brand attitudes (Babin and Carder, 1996b; Karrh, 1994; Vollmers, 1995; Vollmers & Mizerski, 1994).

The findings of this research – that brand placement can change SOAs – are very promising for both researchers and practitioners, since research (Fazio 1990, Fazio, Powell & Williams, 1989) has shown that strongly held associations affect behavior via relatively automatic process. As the Fazio, et al., (1989) study suggests people with highly accessible attitudes towards consumer product are more likely to choose this product, than people with identical, but less accessible attitudes.

The first study also showed that source of brand placement – i.e. character associated with the placement and the programming content where the brand was placed is important in activation of brand related associations. Viewers' involvement with the content within which the brand is placed is correlated with brand related SOAs. Moreover, their desire to emulate the character associated with the placement, which is the combined score of viewers' attitude and perceived similarity to that character, is correlated with their brand related SOAs. This suggests that to maximize the effects of brand placement, marketers should consider not only in which show they place the brand, but also, to which character it is connected.

In both of these cases, neither the desire to emulate the placement associated character, nor the involvement with the show, were able to predict viewers' self reported attitudes towards the placed brand. The juxtaposition of this against SOA findings suggests overall self-reported attitudes might not be sensitive enough to detect the influence of the brand placement on viewers and that SOA and other implicit measures might be a better choice for brand placement research. Since placements by their nature are subtle, the influence they have may not initially lead to a change in expressed

attitudes, but if that influence alters the automatic activation of attitudes toward a brand, then it may arise at a later time.

7.2 DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS OF STUDY 2

The second study was set to further investigate the use of SOA and other implicit measures in brand placement research, especially in conditions where viewers' are specifically informed about the persuasive intent of brand placement. Persuasion knowledge of consumers is known to affect viewers' attitudes towards the brand and the agent (source of persuasion) (Friestad & Wright, 1994). In this research it was shown that viewers, who knew about persuasive intent of brand placement are affected by that differently, than those who were not informed of such intent.

The results supported that placing a brand in the content of programming affects viewers' memory. In general, viewers were able to recollect the placements and its details based on one time exposure. This suggests that brand placement has an effect on viewers' episodic memory. The results also indicate that the effect on episodic memory depends of viewers' knowledge of persuasive intent.

As hypothesized, the results supported that viewers that are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement have higher unaided recall of the placed brand than those who are not aware of such persuasive intent. This indicates that forewarning viewers of the upcoming placement might help them to 'notice' the brand and include it in their list of five top of the mind recalled brands in a given product category. However, the results also indicate that viewers that are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement do not differ in their recognition of the brand and details of the placement

from those viewers that are not aware of such persuasive intent. This finding might be explained by the ‘ceiling effect’. Viewers in both groups have rather high degree of recollection of the placement and its details. Viewers in groups that were given positive information about brand placement did not differ from those that were given negative one. This means that just being aware of the placement, regardless of viewers positive or negative information about it, matters in brand placement effect on memory.

It was further proposed that this enhanced memory will in fact counteract the effect of brand placement on attitudes and SOAs, meaning viewers in the high persuasion knowledge group will have the opportunity to prepare for the persuasion attack and activate various strategies of coping with persuasion, hence minimizing the effect of brand placement. The results partially supported this idea. The brand related SOAs of viewers that are not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement are significantly different from the SOAs of viewers that are exposed to negative information about brand placement.

In fact, using the control group as a baseline, it is clear that brand placement has the strongest effect on viewers in a low persuasion knowledge group, which resembles the usual viewing environment with no forewarning for upcoming placements for television and movie programming. Summarizing these results with the results on memory effects of brand placement, it can be suggested that while forewarning viewers about the upcoming placement may enhance the memory for that brand, it will at the same time minimize the effect on their brand related associations. So, depending on whether marketers’ objective is to affect viewers’ brand associations or their memory, use of forewarning might be justified. For example for the new, small or unknown brand,

the best strategy is to let viewers know about the placement to ensure that they will notice and remember the brand. For more established brands that are trying to affect viewers' attitudes, no forewarning might be advised.

It was also hypothesized that even though throughout the brand placement research and in Study I of this research, explicit self-reported measures of attitudes and purchase intentions were shown not to be sensitive enough to detect the effects of brand placement, use of such measures might be more effective in the high persuasion knowledge group, where viewers are aware of the persuasion attempt. However, as the results show viewers' self-reported attitudes are not different among viewers in control and any of the experimental group. This replicates the results of the previous brand placement studies and Study 1 of this research that showed that explicit measure are not sensitive enough to pick up the effects of brand placement on viewers brand related attitudes.

Combined and modified (compared with Study 1) set of variables, that include Viewers' Overall Attitude towards placement associated characters, their perceived similarity to those characters and their overall attitude and involvement with the show was shown to predict viewers brand related SOAs only in the group where viewers were not informed about the persuasive intent of brand placement. Also, as results show, viewers' attitudes and similarity towards placement associated character, together with viewers' attitudes and involvement with the show can predict viewers' self-reported attitudes towards the show when viewers are presented with the positive information about persuasive intent of brand placement prior to the show.

It may be concluded from the above presented results that self-reported attitudes ‘work’ better (i.e. are able to detect the effects of brand placement) for the high persuasion knowledge group, than for low persuasion knowledge groups, whereas SOA ‘works’ better in low persuasion group. A possible explanation for why the applied measures did not lead to detection of effects of brand placement in the low persuasion knowledge group is that in the selected episode the placement of the brand in question is very prominent, featuring extended audio and visual exposure. This might have interfered with viewers’ information processing, making it more central than peripheral, thus making the viewers more aware of their feelings and attitudes, which in turn helped the self-reported attitudes

Results of this study have shown that people that are not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement do not choose the placed brand at a different rate than those that are aware of such intent. One of the possible explanations of such results is the applied measure of choice. The used choice test was proposed by Law and Braun (2002) as an unobtrusive and implicit measure. However, in its present form (the scenario that asks to shop for a friend) it might not be implicit and unobtrusive enough to detect the effects the brand placement on viewers’ behavior and choice of the brand. Its implicitness it can be increased furthermore, by limiting the cognitive capacity of respondents while completing this measure. The results have also supported the previous findings of brand placement research, that exposure to the brand does not affect viewers’ self-reported purchase intentions of that brand; they are not different for people that are aware of persuasive intent of brand placement and those that are not.

7.3 DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS OF STUDY 3

The third study was set to investigate the differences of brand placement effectiveness for subtle and prominently placed brand, and how viewers' knowledge of persuasion intent of brand placement affects those differences.

This study replicated the results of Study 2 regarding the effects of persuasion knowledge on how viewers remember brand placed in the show. Just as with the Study 2, viewers who were aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement are more likely to mention the placed brand in unaided recall test, than viewers in a low persuasive knowledge group. However, exposure to either prominent or subtle placements did not change the viewers' inclusion of the placed brand in the unaided recall test. Recognition of the placed brand does not differ among viewers that know of the persuasion intent of brand placement and those that do not. Here again exposure to prominent and to subtle placements did not make any difference. Possible explanation of no difference in recognition scores might be the "ceiling effect," since the recognition is high in both high and low persuasion group.

Analysis of the effect of persuasion knowledge and prominence of placed brand showed that viewers that are not aware of persuasive intent of brand placement have different SOA scores for subtly and prominently placed brands. For marketers, this finding indicates that prominence of the placement has an effect on the strength of viewers' brand related association when viewers are not specifically told of about the upcoming placement.

On the other hand, informing viewers of the possibility of the placements neutralizes the effects of prominence on SOAs, because the SOA scores do not differ

among the viewers that are exposed to prominent and to subtle placements. In addition, this study replicated the results of Study 2, showing that SOA scores of people that are not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement are more affected by brand placement, than SOAs of those that are aware of such intent.

The reason for prominence effect showing up only in low persuasion group, might be that when viewers know about brand placement, their defensive strategies to cope with persuasion lessen the effect of prominently placed brands, lowering the strength of association created by brand placement to the level of subtly placed brands. In light on this finding, in order to maximize the effects of viewers' brand related SOAs, the possible recommendation to the marketers placing the brand would be to use the forewarning if the brand is placed subtly and avoid any forewarning for the prominently placed brands.

Effect of prominently and subtly placed brands on viewers' self-reported brand attitudes does not differ among the viewers that are both aware and not aware of the intent of the brand placement. Once again throughout this research self-reported measures failed to detect the effects of brand placement.

This research examined the effects of brand placement on viewers' behavior using the implicit choice test. The choice test used in the Study 2 was modified to add cognitive load, to ensure 'implicitness' of the measure. The findings of this study have shown that prominently placed brands are more likely to be picked over the competitors' brands by people that are not aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement. On the other hand, subtly placed brands are more likely to be picked by people that are aware of the persuasive intent of brand placement than by those that are not.

So, when people know about the persuasive intent of brand placement, they are more likely to dislike the more prominent placement, implicitly choosing the more subtle one. When they are not forewarned about the placement, then the more prominent placement stands out more, making its effects on viewers' choice stronger.

This discussion of the results from the three studies leads to the contribution of this research to theory and practice of brand placement, the limitations of this research and further research directions.

7.4. CONTRIBUTIONS OF THIS RESEARCH PROJECT

This section presents contributions of this research to theoretical foundations of brand placement research, and some practical recommendations stemmed from the results of the three studies.

7.4.1 Theoretical Contributions

The main theoretical contribution of this research is the introduction and use of low involvement, implicit measures for detecting the true effects of brand placement. Though there have been calls for use of low-involvement, implicit measures (Karrh, 1998; Law & Braun, 2000), not much research has been done in this area.

So far, measuring of effects of brand placement was limited to explicit tests that make direct references to the placement event (D'Astous & Chartier, 2000; Gupta & Lord, 1994; Karrh, 1994; Morton & Friedman, 2002). As the literature review in Chapter 2 presents, such research has produced little to no evidence of the effects of brand placement on viewers' brand related attitudes and behavior (Law & Braun, 2000; Russell,

2002), therefore the assumption in the literature was that brand placements must not be as effective as regular advertisements. Law and Braun (2000) argue that the use of such explicit tests for measuring the effects of brand placement can be uninformative and may even misrepresent the influence of the placement. They suggest the use of implicit measures as more appropriate ones. Moreover, Karrh (1994), in the very beginning of brand placement research specifically stated that a “lower-level brand exposure like placements” should be evaluated with lower-involvement measures.

Contrary to explicit measures, where the measurement makes direct reference to the placement event, in implicit measures participants simply perform certain tasks (e.g., a word association or brand choice) that show the possible impact of brand placement on performance. The use of such measures has been suggested in order to uncover the full effects of brand placement on memory, attitudes and/or behavior by brand placement researchers (Karrh, 1995; Karrh, 1998; Law & Braun, 2000).

This study is the first attempt to use such measures to assess the effects of brand placement on brand related attitudes and brand associations, and the second attempt to assess viewers’ behavior.

Although the previous research has shown the effects of brand placement on viewers’ memory, the further effects on attitudes and behavior were not demonstrated. This research showed that in addition to memory, brand placement influences viewers’ brand-related association and their subsequent choice of the placed brand.

This study also helped to map out factors that are influencing viewers’ brand related associations and consequent brand choice. Viewers’ feelings towards the situational factors surrounding brand placement - the characters associated with the

placement, programming where the brand was placed – shown to be important in how brand placement affects their brand associations and choice.

There have been propositions that how viewers are affected by brand placement depends on their attitudes towards the character presenting the brand and towards the show (DeLorme & Reid, 1999; Karrh, 1999). This research showed viewers' attitudes and perceived similarity towards the placement associated characters and their attitudes and involvement with the content of the programming may predict viewers' brand related SOAs. Overall, it supported the importance of situational or environmental factors surrounding the placement in determining its effectiveness. As this research has showed, under such factors can be considered characters, actors associated with the placement and content where the brand was placed. This research also suggested that the brand placement is a complicated concept and a wide array of surrounding factors have significant effects on its success.

This research also suggested that how brand placement affects viewers depend on viewers' knowledge of the persuasion intent of this technique. In many cases viewers who are high on such knowledge have the ability to use their persuasion coping techniques, thus decreasing the effects of brand placement. This research was the first attempt to bring the depth of persuasion knowledge research to the emerging area of brand placement research.

7.4.2 Practical Contributions

In addition to theoretical contributions, this study provides a number of managerial implications for brand placement practitioners. To start with, the importance

is emphasized of not just getting the brand on the screen, but in recognizing what situation the brand is seen in. It is of a crucial importance in influencing viewers' brand related associations to 'connect' the brand to a character that they like and desire to emulate. It is also important to take into account viewers' feelings towards the show that the brand is placed in. Most of the commercial systems measuring the effects of brand placement presented in Chapter 2, are focused on executional variables, such as length of exposure, mode of placement, etc and they tend to ignore the feelings viewers' bring to the context of brand placement. So, the results of this study recommend that more attention be paid to the placement association characters and shows the brand is placed in. This also brings brand placement very close to the concept of celebrity endorsements, in fact some companies - J. Walter Thompson for example - already compare brand placement to implied endorsements, in terms of the effects that it has on viewers. However, more research is needed to compare the full similarities and differences of these two methods of marketing communication.

The other recommendation for brand placement practitioners is a selective use of a forewarning of the upcoming brand placement in the show. Depending on their marketing objective, the advance notice of the placement that viewers will see in the show, might increase the effects of brand placement. For example, if the objective is to influence viewers' memory, then forewarning will be a recommended technique, but if marketers want to influence viewers' brand related associations, then forewarning shouldn't be used. In addition, if the brand is placed prominently, then use of forewarning, will decrease the chances of viewers' choice of that brand, but for subtly

placed brands, forewarning of the upcoming placement will help increase brand choice by viewers.

Such practical implications drawn from this research should help brand placement practitioners derive the most from their placements, by adjusting the elements of the placement in accordance with their desired results.

7.5 LIMITATIONS OF THIS RESEARCH

There are several limitations of this research project, which are proposed to overcome in the future research. First, one television show was used throughout this research project. Logistically it was done for the purpose of consistency of the measures and due to availability of the episodes to the researcher. In addition, at the time of the research, no other television show enjoyed as much popularity among the participant's age group, and no other show have been on air long enough to create the feelings of attachment and involvement. In the future, it is advised to deepen current research by using various stimuli from all types of programming.

Second, as this research was mainly an exploratory, only one placement was used within each stimulus. In addition, for all three studies, only low-involvement product categories were used. Comparative studies for various brands placed within the same episode, might help to shed some light on whether brand placement effectiveness varies depending on type of the product. For example, this research project employed only low-involvement, everyday consumption products. It will be beneficial to test if the Strength of Association and brand attitudes for high-involvement products are similarly influenced by brand placement as low-involvement brands. Also, it might be possible that some

executional variables such as prominence or mode of the placement might moderate the effect of placement of high vs. low involvement brands.

For the choice of the brand measure, memory based choice was expected from participants, however, for such products that can be picked up in the grocery store, the reality presents mostly stimulus based choice, when all relevant brands and their characteristics are present at the time of the decision (Lynch & Srull, 1982).

Though there is some criticism of the extensive use of college student populations as the basis for research, such a population is suggested to be an appropriate one in brand placement research since students are regarded as the primary audience the movie industry is trying to attract (Dortch, 1996). Though the exact demographic profile of moviegoers varies depending on the movie, research shows (Simmons, 1991) that 18-24 year olds have the highest movie attendance of any age bracket, are highest in renting movies, and are the target market for many television shows. Many researchers have used this rationale to employ student samples in their studies of the effects of brand placement (Morton & Friedman, 2002; D'Astous & Chartier, 2000; Gupta & Gould 1997; Gupta & Lord, 1998). However, student sample is listed as a possible limitation of this research, since people of this age might have especially strong attachments and desires to emulate the characters and actors on television, which in turn might affect their feelings and choice of the brands associated with those characters and actors. Replication of this research on other population will help to clarify this issue.

7.6 EXTENSIONS OF THIS RESEARCH

Taking into account the above mentioned limitations, and other ideas, stemmed from this research, the following methodological and content extensions are proposed. Methodological extensions deal with use of various methods and measurements in brand placement research, whereas content extensions present the directions of future research in the area of brand placement.

7.6.1 Methodological Extensions

Further use of other low-involvement measures. As this research project has proved, implicit measures have potential to uncover the actual effects of brand placement, especially when traditional explicit measures fail to detect such effects. There have been calls for supplementing traditional measures with low-involvement ones (e.g Law & Braun, 2000), however not much research has yet resulted. Strength of Association and choice test were implicit measures used in this project. Other measures such as actual choice can be used to further investigate the effects of brand placement on consumer choice and behavior.

Most of the choice for low-involvement product categories is stimulus based (i.e. most of relevant brands and information is present at the moment of the choice, like in the store), and not memory based (i.e. when consumer has to choose the brand using the information in their memory), because the purchase for such products is usually done in the stores with most of the brands are present on the shelves (Lynch & Srull, 1982). So, actual choice of the brand in the simulated store environment, instead of participants reading the scenario, can increase the external validity of the research.

Increase external validity of the study. Most of the brand placement research is done in lab settings (e.g. Law & Braun, 2000; Gupta & Gould, 1997; Vollmers & Mizerski, 1994). While such lab setting are very useful in initial stages of investigation in order to draft the interrelationships between different variables, in order to assess the full effects of brand placement, the real viewing environment should be employed and the results compared to the results of the lab settings. As an example using the actual moviegoers in the cinema before/after the show, exit interviewers, or contacting viewers after they have seen the television show at home, in their usual viewing environment, can help to increase the external validity of brand placement research.

Longitudinal study to analyze the effects of the repetitive exposure to the placed brands and the duration of such effects. Nowadays marketers use brand placement in television shows very extensively. As was mentioned in Chapter 3, some of the shows are specially modified their scripts to incorporate certain brands. More brands are entering into long-term agreements with the channels and TV producers to have their brand incorporated in various episodes of the show, or in various shows on the same channel. This ensures the repetitive exposure to the brand or brand identifiers for loyal viewers. Longitudinal studies would be useful for discovering the effects of repetitive exposure to the brand and the number of exposures/duration for minimum or maximum effects.

7.6.2 Content Extensions

Hard-sell brand placements vs. subtle brand placements. There is some concern in the literature, that as brand placements are becoming more popular, marketers

might be tempted to use “the bigger the better” strategy. However, using the results of Study 3, it might be suggested such strategy might not elicit the highest attitude change or create the strongest association. Evaluation of when “bigger is the best” will be beneficial for practitioners and for researchers that are looking into brand placement optimization strategies.

Established vs. new brand. This research project focused on already established and well-known brands such as Snuggle and Cocoa Puffs. However, there is some evidence in brand placement research that novelty of the brand might influence how its placement is remembered (Nelson 2002). Comparing the effects of brand placement for well-known brands with the established reputation and market share, and new or small local brands will provide an interesting extension of this study. It might be possible that researchers just encountering the ceiling effect, when they are trying to measure the change in memory or attitude for placed established brands and not seeing much difference.

Interactive Brand Placements vs. traditional brand placements. This research project used traditional brand placements as a stimulus. However, interactive TV, gives viewers the ability to purchase the brand/product they see online right there on the spot. This increases the potential benefits of brand placement, reducing the amount of time and effort for viewers to respond. Though the technology is already in place, the rise of interactive television is not going as fast as it was initially predicted. The networks found the way around this – on most of the websites of the shows viewer can find a link to the list of all the brands seen in specific episode and a link to directly purchase the product. This introduced interactivity in the sphere of brand placement, gives this technique a very

unique ability to influence consumers immediately before making the decision, which to a certain extent makes it similar to point of purchase advertising. An interesting research opportunity would be to compare the effectiveness of these two methods on viewers' choice of the brand as well as on their brand related associations and attitudes.

Brand placements in media with different level of presence and involvement.

This research was focused on brand placements on television, since television is one of the most popular medium for that. However, as the discussion in Chapter 2 suggest, there are increasing number of instances of brand placement in video games and online. Gaming and web surfing environment has significantly different level of audience involvement. Involvement with the media strongly relates to how the persuasive messages coming through that medium gets processed (1965).

The possible extension of the research will be to evaluate the difference of brand placement effectiveness in media with different levels of audience involvement. Using the concept of low-involvement learning in combination with the concept of involvement with the media high viewer involvement with the medium may mean that they will pay less attention to the placed brands. Research suggests that under such conditions, recall and recognition of the placed brands will be inhibited (Grigorovici & Constantin, 2004), whereas in the low involvement media, such as television, brands will be remembered better. Moreover, it may be that within each medium, low involvement with the programming or the game will lead to better persuasion and worse memory, than high involvement.

The objectives of his research were, first, to investigate the influence of brand placement on viewers' memory, attitude and behavior, identify the various factors that are believed to have an influence on it; and second, to evaluate the use of low involvement, implicit measures in detecting the true effects of brand placement on consumers.

This research has found that brand placement has an effect on viewers' memory, brand related associations and subsequent brand choice. The extent of this effect depends on viewers' awareness of persuasive intent of brand placement and the prominence of the placement. While research methods for investigating the effectiveness of brand placement will evolve as the practice evolves, at this stage the combination of the explicit and implicit measures proposed in this research presents the biggest potential in predicting the effectiveness of brand placement.

Appendix A: Sample Descriptions

Sample Description for Study 1

Gender * Group Cross-tabulation for Study 1

	Control Group	Experimental Group	Total count	Total %
Male	6	4	10	23.8%
Female	14	18	32	76.2%
Total	20	22	42*	100%

* One person did not indicate his/her gender. Total number of participants in this study is 43

TV Watching Habits * Group Cross-tabulation for Study 1

TV watching habits	Control Group	Experimental Group	Total %
Less than 1 hour a day	6	11	40.5%
More than one hour but less than two hours	7	4	26.2%
More than two hours but less than three hours	5	5	23.8%
Three and more hours a day	2	2	9.5%
Total	20	22	100%

* One person did not indicate his/her TV watching habits. Total number of participants in this study is 43.

Sample Description for Study 2

Gender * Group Cross-tabulation for Study 2

	Group A Control	Group B Low PK	Group C High positive PK	Group D High negative PK	Total %
Male	12	9	8	14	30.1%
Female	26	26	18	30	69.9%
Total	38	35	26	44	100%

TV Watching Habits * Group Cross-tabulation for Study 2

	Group Control Group	Low PK	High positive PK	High negative PK	Total %
TV watching habits					
Less than 1 hour a day	5	8	12	10	24.5 %
More than one hour but less than two hours	16	15	8	11	35 %
More than two hours but less than three hours	12	5	6	11	23.8 %
Three and more hours a day	5	7	0	12	16.8 %
Total	38	35	26	44	100%

Sample Description for Study 3

Gender * Group Cross-tabulation for Study 3

	Control Group	Low PK prominent	Low PK subtle	High PK prominent	High PK subtle	Total %
Male	8	7	5	9	9	36.9%
Female	11	12	19	11	12	63.1%
Total	19	19	24	20	21	100%

TV Watching Habits * Group Cross-tabulation for Study 3

TV watching habits	Group					Total %
	Control Group	Low PK prominent	Low PK subtle	High PK prominent	High PK subtle	
Less than 1 hour a day	4	7	4	10	7	31.1%
More than one hour but less than two hours	6	6	5	4	7	27.2%
More than two hours but less than three hours	8	5	9	5	4	30.1%
Three and more hours a day	1	1	6	1	3	11.7%
Total	19	19	24	20	21	100%

Appendix B: Description of the stimuli

Stimulus for Study 1 and 2: Excerpt from the episode “The One with the East German Laundry Detergent” - Television Show “Friends” Season 1

(Scene: Central Perk, all are there. Angela, a beautiful woman in a tight dress, enters.)

Angela: Hi, Joey.

Joey: My god, Angela. *(Angela takes a seat at the counter.)*

Monica: Wow, being dumped by you obviously agrees with her.

Phoebe: Are you gonna go over there?

Joey: No, yeah, no, ok, but not yet. I don't wanna seem too eager. One Mississippi, two Mississippi, three Mississippi. That seems pretty cool. *(He walks over to her)* Hey, Angela.

Angela: *(casually)* Joey.

Joey: You look good.

Angela: That's because I'm wearing a dress that accents my boobs.

Joey: You don't say.

(Cut to Ross and Rachel, talking next to one of the tables.)

Ross: So, uh, Rachel, what are you, uh, what're you doing tonight?

Rachel: Oh, big glamour night. Me and Monica at Laundorama.

Ross: Oh, you uh, you wanna hear a freaky coincidence? Guess who's doing laundry there too?

Rachel: Who?

Ross: Me. Was that not clear? Hey, why don't, um, why don't I just join you both, here?

Rachel: Don't you have a laundry room in your building?

Ross: Yes, I do have a laundry room in my building, um, but there's a.... rat problem. Apparently they're attracted to the dryer sheets, and they're goin' in fine, but they're comin' out all.... fluffy. Anyway, say, sevenish?

Rachel: Sure.

(Cut back to Joey and Angela at the counter.)

Angela: Forget it Joey. I'm with Bob now.

Joey: Bob? Who the hell's Bob?

Angela: Bob is great. He's smart, he's sophisticated, and he has a real job. You, you go on three auditions a month and you call yourself an actor, but Bob...

Joey: Come on, we were great together. And not just at the fun stuff, but like, talking too.

Angela: Yeah, well, sorry, Joe. You said let's just be friends, so guess what?

Joey: What?

Angela: We're just friends.

Joey: Fine, fine, so, why don't the four of us go out and have dinner together tonight? You know, as friends?

Angela: What four of us?

Joey: You know, you and Bob, and me and my girlfriend, uh, uh, Monica.

(Scene: Monica and Rachel's apartment, Joey is there, trying to convince Monica to pose as his girlfriend. His plan is to hook Monica up with Angela's boyfriend Bob and then take Angela back for himself.)

Joey: Monica, I'm tellin' you, this guy is perfect for you.

Monica: Forget it. Not after your cousin who could belch the alphabet.

Joey: Come on. This guy's great. His name's Bob. He's Angela's... brother. He's smart, he's sophisticated, and he has a real job. Me, I go on three auditions a month and call myself an actor, but Bob is...

Monica: (looking out window) Oh, god help us.

Joey: What?

Monica: Ugly Naked Guy's laying kitchen tile. Eww!

Joey: Eww! Look, I'm asking a favor here. If I do this for her brother, maybe Angela will come back to me.

Monica: What's going on here? You go out with tons of girls.

Joey: (proud) I know, but, I made a huge mistake. I never should have broken up with her. Will you help me? Please?

(Scene: Ross' apartment, Chandler is over.)

Ross: (on phone) Ok, bye. (hangs up) Well, Monica's not coming, it's just gonna be me and Rachel.

Chandler: Oh. Well, hold on camper, are you sure you've thought this thing through?

Ross: It's laundry. The thinking through is minimal.

Chandler: It's just you and Rachel, just the two of you? This is a date. You're going on a date.

Ross: Nuh-uh.

Chandler: Yuh-huh. Gee, haven't done that in a while.

Ross: Is it a date if she doesn't know we are on a date?

Chandler: Yes, absolutely. Saturday night – all rules apply.

Ross: So what're you saying here? I should shave again, pick up some wine, what?

Chandler: Well, you may wanna rethink the dirty underwear. This is basically the first time she's gonna see your underwear—you want it to be dirty?

Ross: (sheepish) No.

Chandler: Oh, and uh, the fabric softener?

Ross: Ok, ok, now what is wrong with my Snuggles? *(Picking up a fabric softener Camera zooms on the brand)*. What, it says I'm a sensitive, warm kinda guy, you know, like a warm, fuzzy bear. Ok, I can pick something else up on the way.

Chandler: There you go.

(Scene: A fancy restaurant, Joey and Monica are there, meeting Angela and Bob, who Monica thinks is Angela's brother.)

Monica: Thank you. So what does this Bob guy look like? Is he tall? Short?

Joey: Yep.

Monica: Which?

Joey: Which what?

Monica: You've never met Bob, have you?

Joey: No, but he's...

Monica: Oh my god, Joey, for all we know this guy could be horribly...

(Angela and Bob walk in. Bob is good-looking.)

Angela: Hey, Joey.

Monica: ...horribly attractive. I'll be shutting up now.

Stimulus for Study 3:
Excerpt from the episode “The One Where Chandler Takes a Bath”
Television Show “Friends” Season 8

(Scene: Rachel and Joey’s, Joey is sitting on his recliner as Phoebe enters.)

Phoebe: Hey.

Joey: Hey. Well, what’s up?

Phoebe: Umm, Joey, I know.

Joey: What?

Phoebe: I knooow.

Joey: Whaaat?

Phoebe: I know about your feelings.

Joey: Oh my God. You do?

Phoebe: Yes, and I’m sorry. I-I know things worked out for Chandler and Monica, but that’s very rare.

Joey: I know. I know. And this is so much more complicated than it was for those guys. I mean, it’s Rachel for God sakes.

Phoebe: For God sakes, it’s Rachel!

Joey: I know. I know. And she’s not only my friend; she’s my pregnant friend! She’s my pregnant friend who’s Ross’ ex!

Phoebe: Yeah that’s Rachel. (To herself) Beat me over the head with it.

Joey: What am I going to do? You know, and I keep, I keep trying to get rid of these feelings, y’know? I stayed up all last night and made a list of everything I don’t like about her. You want to hear it?

Phoebe: Yeah.

Joey: She made me switch to light Mayo. That’s it! That’s all I got! And, you know what? It tastes the same and my pants fit better!

Phoebe: Joey, I just think you’re getting worked up over nothing. This is probably just a crush.

Joey: You think?

Phoebe: Absolutely! Y’know, you get this rush of feelings, but then it goes away.

Joey: Yeah, just a crush! That’s all this is! It’s a crush! I’m Joey; I don’t get deep feelings.

Phoebe: That’s right, there you go! Crushes happen all the time! I know I’ve had them for all you guys. Well, except for Ross and Chandler. And I’m sure you’ve had them for us.

Joey: Not really.

Phoebe: Mm-hmm. (To herself) Throw me a bone here.

(Scene: Central Perk, Rachel is on the couch as Ross enters.)

Ross: So, I uh... I called the doctor and now we both know the sex of the baby.

Rachel: What?

Ross: That’s right. The student has become the master.

Rachel: Ross, I swear, I don’t know.

Ross: Oh, come on, you know it’s a girl!

Rachel: A what?!

Ross: You really didn’t know?

Rachel: We’re having a girl?

Ross: No.

Rachel: That’s what you just said!

Ross: No.

Rachel: You said girl!

Ross: Yes. I’m... I’m sorry. I’m so sorry.

Rachel: I’m not! We’re having a girl! Sometimes I can’t believe it’s with you—But still! We’re having a girl!

Ross: I know! I know. You know what? I’m putting Ruth back on the table!

Rachel: Oh, yes! We'll have ourselves a little baby Ruth...

Ross: Permission to veto.

Rachel: Yes, please.

(Scene: Monica and Chandler's, Chandler enters as Monica comes from the bathroom.)

Monica: Hey.

Chandler: Do I smell essential oils?

Monica: Yeah, I'm going to take a bath. I'm just going to get a magazine.

Chandler: Okay.

(As soon as Monica leaves the room, Chandler takes off his jacket and runs to the bathroom. Monica enters the bathroom to find Chandler in the bathtub.)

Monica: What do you think you're doing?

Chandler: L-leaving my troubles behind?

Monica: I know that you're new at this, but this is completely unacceptable bath decorum.

Chandler: Oh, it's so hard to care when you're this relaxed.

Monica: Fine, you can have the bath, but I am taking your boat. Now you're just a girl in a tub!

(Phoebe enters the bathroom)

Chandler: (upset) Hey!

Phoebe: Hi, Bubbles. Manly. Well, I just thought I would drop by and let you know how it went with Joey.

Chandler: (To Monica) You told her?!

Monica: She pulled it out of me! She's like a conversational wizard! How'd it go?

Phoebe: Well, you were wrong, he doesn't like me!

Monica: What?

Phoebe: Yeah! How would you like it if I sent you to Lee Majors' house and told you that he liked you, and you went down there and you found out that he didn't like you? How would you feel?

Monica: (Pause) I don't think I'd care.

Phoebe: Really? Lee Majors is hot!

Joey: (from outside the bathroom) Hello?

Phoebe: We're in the bathroom!

Joey: Why?

Chandler: (sarcastically) Because it's a relaxing and enjoyable time!

Joey: (entering the bathroom) What are you guys doing in here?

Monica: Oh my God! A friend he's looking at differently, but it's wrong. It's Rachel!

Chandler: You like Rachel?!

Joey: It's no big deal, okay? Phoebe and I talked about it. It's just a crush! It's going to go away! *(Looks down)* Dude, you gotta rearrange your bubbles! Oh!

Phoebe: (checking for herself) (To Monica) Mazel tov.

Rachel: (entering) Hey! Ross and I were looking for you! What are we all doing in here? *(Looks at Chandler)* Oh, my! *(Covers the spot where Joey wants bubbles to be replaced.)*

Monica: Honey, cover it up with the boat!

Ross: (from outside the bathroom) Hello?

Chandler: (sarcastically) Yes we're all in here and we would love for you to join us!

Ross: (entering) Well hey! What's going on? Ooh, cool boat—(Sees why the boat's there)—Oh, no. *(Averts his eyes by looking around the room)* (To Rachel) Hey, did you, did you tell them?

Rachel: No, I was waiting for you!

Phoebe: Tell us what?

Rachel: We're having a girl.

All: Oh, wow! Yay! Wow! Hooray! Oh, man!

(They all hug and then turn and look at Chandler)

Chandler: I'll...I'll get you later!

[Scene: Joey and Rachel's, Joey is sitting at the counter eating Cocoa Puffs.]

Joey: *(thinking while eating cereal out of a bowl. The box is clearly visible and the brand is Cocoa Puffs)* *. All right. It's a new day, and it's just a crush, that's all! Just a little crush! All that worrying I was doing, that was crazy. Crazy! Like my friend here the bird would say, *(Gestures with the spoon, branded box is still visible)* "it was cuckoo!" Everything's going to be fine. It's just a crush.

Rachel: *(entering)* Hi, sweetie.

Joey: *(thinking)* I love you.

* For the subtle placement, brand exposure is cut to two seconds visual only. For prominent the placement is about ten seconds, with branded box taking about twenty % of a screen and a verbal mentioning of a "Cockoo bird" famous cartoon character of a brand.

Appendix C: Sample of Informed Consent Form Signed by Research Participants

IRB # 2003-5-0032

Informed Consent to Participate in Research

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

You are being asked to participate in a research study. This form provides you with information about the study. The Principal Investigator (the person in charge of this research) or his/her representative will also describe this study to you and answer all of your questions. Please read the information below and ask questions about anything you don't understand before deciding whether or not to take part. Your participation is entirely voluntary and you can refuse to participate without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Title of Research Study:

In order to maintain the integrity of the data collected, it is not appropriate to disclose the title of the study before you take part in it. Following the procedure, the purpose and title of the study will be fully explained, and any questions you have at that time will be answered.

Principal Investigator(s) (include faculty sponsor), UT affiliation, and Telephone Number(s):

Anna Andriasova, Graduate Student at the University of Texas at Austin, Phone: (202) 538 18 07

Professor Isabella Cunningham, faculty member at the University of Texas at Austin, (512) 4711101

Funding source:

None

What is the purpose of this study?

This study is part of the dissertation research. If you are given a specific explanation of the purpose of the study before taking part in it, the results may not be valid; so the purpose of the study cannot be completely explained at this time. Following the study, you will be given a full description of the research, and you may ask the person who is running the study, or the Principal Investigator listed above, any questions you like after the study is completed today. This study will include up to 600 participants.

What will be done if you take part in this research study?

If you agree to take part in this study, you will be asked to view less than twenty minutes of television programming and answer number of questions.

What are the possible discomforts and risks?

There are no risks associated with the study.

What are the possible benefits to you or to others?

Participation in this research will give you a first-hand experience in research in the area. In general, the results of this study will help understanding the effects of television communication on human behavior.

If you choose to take part in this study, will it cost you anything?

No, it will not cost you anything to participate in this study.

Will you receive compensation for your participation in this study?

No, you will not receive any compensation for your participation.

What if you are injured because of the study?

If injuries occur as a result of study activity, eligible University students may be treated at the usual level of care with the usual cost for services at the Student Health Center, but no payment can be provided in the event of a medical problem.

If you do not want to take part in this study, what other options are available to you?

Participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You are free to refuse to be in the study, and your refusal will not influence current or future relationships with The University of Texas at Austin

How can you withdraw from this research study and who should I call if I have questions?

If you wish to stop your participation in this research study for any reason, you should contact: Anna Andriasova at (202) 538 18 07. You are free to withdraw your consent and stop participation in this research study at any time without penalty or loss of benefits for which you may be entitled. Throughout the study, the researchers will notify you of new information that may become available and that might affect your decision to remain in the study.

In addition, if you have questions about your rights as a research participant, please contact Clarke A. Burnham, Ph.D., Chair, The University of Texas at Austin Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects, 512/232-4383.

How will your privacy and the confidentiality of your research records be protected?

No video or audio recording of the event is necessary. No personally-identifying information will be connected to your responses, and so your responses will be received anonymously.

Authorized persons from The University of Texas at Austin and the Institutional Review Board have the legal right to review your research records and will protect the confidentiality of those records to the extent permitted by law. If the research project is sponsored then the sponsor also have the legal right to review your research records. Otherwise, your research records will not be released without your consent unless required by law or a court order.

If the results of this research are published or presented at scientific meetings, your identity will not be disclosed.

Will the researchers benefit from your participation in this study?

The researchers will receive no monetary or other benefits from your participation beyond those normally associated with conducting research, such as knowledge generation.

Signatures:

As a representative of this study, I have explained the purpose, the procedures, the benefits, and the risks that are involved in this research study:

Signature and printed name of person obtaining consent

Date

You have been informed about this study's purpose, procedures, possible benefits and risks, and you have received a copy of this Form. You have been given the opportunity to ask questions before you sign, and you have been told that you can ask other questions at any time. You voluntarily agree to participate in this study. By signing this form, you are not waiving any of your legal rights.

Printed Name of Participant

Date

Signature of Participant

Date



03/20/06

Signature of Principal Investigator

Date

Appendix D: Copy of Priming Statements Used in Study 2 & 3

Positive Statements Regarding Brand Placement for Study 2

Please read the following statements carefully

Product placement is a promotional tactic used by marketers, that involves placing real brands and products in television shows and movies with the purpose to influence viewers' attitudes and behaviors towards that product. As the practice of product placement becomes more common, it also becomes more controversial.

This is what some people think about the practice of product placement:

"When we watch movies or shows, we're trying to put ourselves in them. We just want to become absorbed and brands make it more realistic because they're things we deal with every day. It lends an air of reality to it, an air of authenticity."

"It's great to see stuff we normally use blended in to be part of the story."

"It's almost a friendly feeling of recognition – seeing a product you can relate to immediately. You recognize something that you used before or some product that you enjoy or whatever. And when you see it on the screen it makes you feel a part of something because you're not the only one drinking it or eating it or wearing it."

"When you see a brand in a movie or a show you usually associate it with that character – and if it's somebody you liked, you might try something that you didn't try before if you saw it linked with him or her."

Negative Statements Regarding Brand Placement for Study 2

Please read the following statements carefully

Product placement is a promotional tactic used by marketers, that involves placing real brands and products in television shows and movies with the purpose to influence viewers' attitudes and behaviors towards that product. As the practice of product placement becomes more common, it also becomes more controversial.

This is what some people think about the practice of product placement:

“It’s very annoying to have the camera pause momentarily here and there and distract me from being somewhere else in the story. I feel like I am in a commercial that I paid six bucks to see.”

“The last ten or fifteen years, it just seems that every time somebody has a drink or something in a show or a movie, the label is pointing at you and you can recognize what it is.”

“It makes me want things that I don’t have and can’t afford. In the movies, you’ll see the way people live that you know is beyond your means – brand placement may make the hill even steeper to climb.”

“I think for me it’s more of a danger signal – the thing I worry about is that it will get more prevalent and we’ll see brands all over the place and life will turn into a big long advertisement.”

Statements Regarding Brand Placement for Study 3

Please read the following statements carefully

Brand placement is a promotional tactic used by marketers, which involves placing real brands in television shows and movies with the purpose to influence viewers' attitudes and behaviors towards that brand. As the practice of brand placement becomes more common, it also becomes more controversial.

This is what some people think about the practice of brand placement:

“When you see a brand in a movie or a show you usually associate it with that character – and if it’s somebody you liked, you might try something that you didn’t try before if you saw it linked with him or her. Also, brands make movies and shows more realistic because they’re things we deal with every day.”

“It’s almost a friendly feeling of recognition – seeing a product you can relate to immediately. You recognize something that you used before or some product that you enjoy. And when you see it on the screen it makes you feel a part of something because you’re not the only one drinking it or eating it or wearing it.”

“The last ten or fifteen years, it just seems that every time somebody has a drink or something in a show or a movie, the label is pointing at you and you can recognize what it is.”

“It’s very annoying to have the camera pause momentarily here and there and distract me from being somewhere else in the story. I feel like I am watching a commercial.”

Appendix E: Description and Copy of Strength of Association Measures

Strength of Association Measure for Study 1 & 2

In the beginning of the measure, participants are presented four lists of words, two at a time. The first pairing of lists contains synonyms of *soft* (Snuggle's main attribute) and *hard* (the opposite of Snuggle's main attribute). The second pair of lists contains positive and negative adjectives. Each list contains eight words of each type, and these words are later used as items in association tasks. Participants are asked to familiarize themselves with the words before the experiment progresses.

The list of words associated with *soft* includes *fluffy, gentle, plush, comfy, cushy, cottony, soothing* and *fuzzy*, and the list of words associated with *hard* includes *tough, rocky, rugged, coarse, jagged, solid, rough* and *harsh*. The list of positive adjectives includes *good, pleasant, valuable, favorable, acceptable, nice, wonderful*, and *excellent*. The list of negative adjectives includes *bad, unpleasant, worthless, unfavorable, unacceptable, awful, horrible*, and *poor*.

The synonyms and words associated with *soft* and *hard* were chosen using an online dictionary (www.dictionary.com) where the search was done to find out all the possible synonyms of the words *soft* and *hard*. Later the list was pre-tested on a group of advertising graduate students to determine eight words, which are easier associated with *soft* and *hard*. The list of positive and negative words was adopted from Wagner (2001).

Once the participants have studied each set of words (indicated by raising their heads), the researcher begins the judgment stages. The first two stages are "practice stages," wherein participants become familiar with the activity of categorizing words before being assessed. In the first of these stages, the lists of words associated with *soft* and *hard* run down the middle of the page, mixed in a random fashion. Each stage lasts fifteen seconds, during which time the participants have to move down the list of words sequentially, and categorize them by placing a checkmark on the appropriate side, as indicated at the top of the page (i.e., "*soft*" is printed on the left or right, with "*hard*" opposing). Before each stage, the participants are given verbal instructions as to what the appropriate side would be. For example:

SOFT

HARD

JAGGED
GENTLE

The second stage is similar to the first, except that the list is of positive and negative adjectives with "*positive*" and "*negative*" appearing on the sides of the page at the top.

The third stage is a critical judgment phase, or one that is used in the final SOA calculation, and it includes all four types of words. The list begins with either one of the

two pairings described above – a positive/negative adjective or a soft/hard word – and goes on, alternating each word with one coming from the other category. Therefore, one of the sides is the proper side to check for words associated with either “*soft*” or “*positive*”, while the other is the correct side for “*hard*” or “*negative*”. The specific sides match those used in the preceding practice stages for all participants. For example:

SOFT or *positive*

HARD or *negative*

awful
SOOTHING
good
HARSH

Once again, the participants are supposed to go sequentially down the list and categorize as many of these words as they can in fifteen seconds. This phase includes two such lists, given one after the other.

The fourth stage is another practice stage, with the list only including *soft/hard* words. This stage is meant to give participants some familiarity with categorizing *soft* and *hard* on the page sides opposite those they had just used. This is done because the measure calculates attitudes by subtracting the number of items correctly categorized when pairing *soft* with positive adjectives from the number correctly categorized when pairing *soft* with negative adjectives. Thus, in the fifth stage, another critical judgment phase, the appropriate side for *soft* and *hard* is switched while keeping positive and negative constant.

The fifth stage requires simultaneous categorization of words associated with both *soft/hard* and *positive/negative* adjectives. This phase is the same as the third stage except that the appropriate side for the *soft* and *hard* words is switched, and participants are therefore categorizing these names with the opposite kind of adjective.

The order of pairing *soft* with *positive* versus *soft* with *negative* words (i.e., phases 3 and 5), is counterbalanced across participants. The scores for each of the two critical phases – *soft* paired with *positive* and *soft* paired with *negative* adjectives – are summed into positive and negative indices, respectively, and the negative phase scores are subtracted from the positive phase scores to create an SOA Difference Score Index (Lowery, Hardin, & Sinclair, 2001; Wagner, 2001). Below is presented the copy of SOA measure used in Study 1 and Study 2.

Copy of SOA Measure for Study 1 and Study 2

<u>SOFT</u>	HARD
FLUFFY	TOUGH
GENTLE	ROCKY
PLUSH	RUGGED
COMFY	COARSE
CUSHY	JAGGED
COTTONY	SOLID
SOOTHING	ROUGH
FUZZY	HARSH

STOP. DO NOT CONTINUE!

<u>POSITIVE</u>	<u>NEGATIVE</u>
<i>good</i>	<i>bad</i>
<i>pleasant</i>	<i>unpleasant</i>
<i>valuable</i>	<i>worthless</i>
<i>favorable</i>	<i>unfavorable</i>
<i>acceptable</i>	<i>unacceptable</i>
<i>nice</i>	<i>awful</i>
<i>wonderful</i>	<i>horrible</i>
<i>excellent</i>	<i>poor</i>

STOP. DO NOT CONTINUE!

SOFT**HARD**

	ROCKY	
	PLUSH	
	COTTONY	
	ROUGH	
	FUZZY	
	TOUGH	
	GENTLE	
	RUGGED	
	FLUFFY	
	COARSE	
	JAGGED	
	COMFY	
	CUSHY	
	SOLID	
	SOOTHING	
	HARSH	

STOP. DO NOT CONTINUE!

positive

negative

	<i>favorable</i>	
	<i>worthless</i>	
	<i>pleasant</i>	
	<i>unacceptable</i>	
	<i>wonderful</i>	
	<i>bad</i>	
	<i>unpleasant</i>	
	<i>valuable</i>	
	<i>unfavorable</i>	
	<i>excellent</i>	
	<i>awful</i>	
	<i>good</i>	
	<i>horrible</i>	
	<i>acceptable</i>	
	<i>nice</i>	
	<i>poor</i>	

STOP. DO NOT CONTINUE!

SOFT OR POSITIVE**HARD OR NEGATIVE**

	COMFY	
	<i>valuable</i>	
	RUGGED	
	<i>unacceptable</i>	
	COARSE	
	<i>favorable</i>	
	COTTONY	
	<i>worthless</i>	
	ROUGH	
	<i>wonderful</i>	
	FLUFFY	
	<i>horrible</i>	
	SOLID	
	<i>pleasant</i>	
	CUSHY	
	<i>unpleasant</i>	
	JAGGED	
	<i>awful</i>	
	PLUSH	
	<i>excellent</i>	
	TOUGH	
	<i>acceptable</i>	
	FUZZY	
	<i>nice</i>	
	ROCKY	
	<i>bad</i>	
	GENTLE	
	<i>unfavorable</i>	
	SOOTHING	
	<i>good</i>	
	HARSH	
	<i>poor</i>	

STOP. DO NOT CONTINUE!

SOFT OR POSITIVE**HARD OR NEGATIVE**

	<i>unfavorable</i>	
	ROUGH	
	<i>excellent</i>	
	GENTLE	
	<i>bad</i>	
	PLUSH	
	<i>wonderful</i>	
	RUGGED	
	<i>poor</i>	
	FLUFFY	
	<i>worthless</i>	
	FUZZY	
	<i>horrible</i>	
	COARSE	
	<i>pleasant</i>	
	ROCKY	
	<i>acceptable</i>	
	CUSHY	
	<i>unpleasant</i>	
	COTTONY	
	<i>good</i>	
	TOUGH	
	<i>nice</i>	
	HARSH	
	<i>favorable</i>	
	COMFY	
	<i>unacceptable</i>	
	SOOTHING	
	<i>awful</i>	
	SOLID	
	<i>valuable</i>	
	JAGGED	

STOP. DO NOT CONTINUE!

HARD**SOFT**

	FLUFFY	
	HARSH	
	FLUFFY	
	TOUGH	
	GENTLE	
	ROCKY	
	SOOTHING	
	SOLID	
	PLUSH	
	RUGGED	
	COTTONEY	
	JUGGED	
	COMFY	
	COARSE	
	CUSHY	
	ROUGH	

STOP. DO NOT CONTINUE!

HARD OR *POSITIVE*

SOFT OR *NEGATIVE*

	PLUSH	
	<i>good</i>	
	JAGGED	
	<i>excellent</i>	
	FUZZY	
	<i>horrible</i>	
	COTTONY	
	<i>valuable</i>	
	ROUGH	
	<i>poor</i>	
	SOOTHING	
	<i>nice</i>	
	ROCKY	
	<i>unpleasant</i>	
	HARSH	
	<i>favorable</i>	
	GENTLE	
	<i>acceptable</i>	
	TOUGH	
	<i>awful</i>	
	FLUFFY	
	<i>bad</i>	
	SOLID	
	<i>wonderful</i>	
	RUGGED	
	<i>unfavorable</i>	
	CUSHY	
	<i>unacceptable</i>	
	COARSE	
	<i>pleasant</i>	
	COMFY	

STOP. DO NOT CONTINUE!

HARD OR *POSITIVE***SOFT OR *NEGATIVE***

	<i>awful</i>	
	COMFY	
	<i>good</i>	
	GENTLE	
	<i>acceptable</i>	
	COARSE	
	<i>unfavorable</i>	
	PLUSH	
	<i>valuable</i>	
	SOLID	
	<i>bad</i>	
	FLUFFY	
	<i>nice</i>	
	RUGGED	
	<i>unpleasant</i>	
	JAGGED	
	<i>wonderful</i>	
	ROUGH	
	<i>horrible</i>	
	SOOTHING	
	<i>excellent</i>	
	HARSH	
	<i>poor</i>	
	CUSHY	
	<i>pleasant</i>	
	ROCKY	
	<i>favorable</i>	
	COTTONY	
	<i>unacceptable</i>	
	TOUGH	
	<i>worthless</i>	

STOP. DO NOT CONTINUE!

Strength of Association Measure for Study 3

Similarly to the previous studies, SOA measure for Study 3 consists of a five judgment stages, where each stage contains a list of words (judgment items) printed down the middle of a page. The participant is asked to categorize each word by placing a checkmark in the appropriate column, either on the left or the right of the word.

In the beginning of the measure, participants are presented four lists of words, two at a time. The first pairing of lists contains words associated with breakfast cereals and words associated with bagels. The second pair of lists contains positive and negative adjectives. Each list contains eight words of each type, and these words are later used as items in association tasks. Participants are asked to familiarize themselves with the words before the experiment progresses.

The list of words associated with *cereals* includes *spoon, milk, chocolatey crunchy, sweet, flakes, puffs* and *bowl*, and the list of words associated with *bagels* includes *knife, cream cheese, butter, potato, pumpernickel, shmears sesame seeds, onions*. The list of positive adjectives includes *good, pleasant, valuable, favorable, acceptable, nice, wonderful*, and *excellent*. The list of negative adjectives includes *bad, unpleasant, worthless, unfavorable, unacceptable, awful, horrible*, and *poor*.

The list of words – synonyms and words associated with *cereals* and *bagels* were chosen after an informal in-depth interviews with marketing and advertising graduate students that were asked to list all the words they can think of in those word categories. The lists of positive and negative words were adopted from Wagner (2001) and are identical to the ones used for Study 1 and Study 2.

Once the participants have studied each set of words (indicated by raising their heads), the researcher begins the judgment stages. The first two stages are “practice stages,” wherein participants become familiar with the activity of categorizing words before being assessed. In the first of these stages, the lists of words associated with *cereal* and *bagel* run down the middle of the page, mixed in a random fashion. Just as in the Study 1 and Study 2, each stage lasts fifteen seconds, during which time the participants have to move down the list of words sequentially, and categorize them by placing a checkmark on the appropriate side, as indicated at the top of the page (i.e., “cereal” is printed on the left or right, with “bagel” opposing). Before each stage, the participants are given verbal instructions as to what the appropriate side would be. For example:

CEREAL

BAGELS

POTATO
MILK

The second stage is similar to the first, except that the list is of positive and negative adjectives with “*positive*” and “*negative*” appearing on the sides of the page at the top.

The third stage is a critical judgment phase and it includes all four types of words. The list begins with either one of the two pairings described above – a positive/negative adjective or a *cereal/bagel* word – and goes on, alternating each word with one coming from the other category. Therefore, one of the sides is the proper side to check for words associated with either “*cereal*” or “*positive*”, while the other is the correct side for “*bagel*” or “*negative*”. The specific sides match those used in the preceding practice stages for all participants. For example:

BAGEL or *positive*

CEREAL or *negative*

awful
PUFFS
good
CREAM CHEESE

Once again, the participants are supposed to go sequentially down the list and categorize as many of these words as they can in fifteen seconds. This phase includes two such lists, given one after the other.

The fourth stage is another practice stage, with the list only including *cereal/bagel* words. This stage is meant to give participants some familiarity with categorizing *cereal* and *bagels* on the page sides opposite those they had just used.

The fifth stage requires simultaneous categorization of words associated with both *cereal/bagels* and *positive/negative* adjectives. This phase is the same as the third stage except that the appropriate side for the *cereal* and *bagels* words is switched, and participants are therefore categorizing these names with the opposite kind of adjective. The order of pairing *cereal* with *positive* versus *cereal* with *negative* words (i.e., phases 3 and 5), is counterbalanced across participants.

Alike with Study 1 and Study 2, the scores for each of the two critical phases – *cereal* paired with *positive* and *cereal* paired with *negative* adjectives – are summed into positive and negative indices, respectively, and the negative phase scores are subtracted from the positive phase scores to create an SOA Difference Score Index (Lowery, Hardin, & Sinclair, 2001; Wagner, 2001). Below is presented SOA measure for Study 3.

Copy of SOA Measure for Study 3

<u>CEREAL</u>	<u>BAGELS</u>
SPOON	KNIFE
MILK	CREAM CHEESE
CHOCOLATEY	BUTTER
CRUNCHY	POTATO
SWEET	PUMPERNICKEL
FLAKES	SHMEARS
PUFFS	SESAME SEEDS
BOWL	ONIONS

STOP. DO NOT CONTINUE!

<u>POSITIVE</u>	<u>NEGATIVE</u>
<i>good</i>	<i>bad</i>
<i>pleasant</i>	<i>unpleasant</i>
<i>valuable</i>	<i>worthless</i>
<i>favorable</i>	<i>unfavorable</i>
<i>acceptable</i>	<i>unacceptable</i>
<i>nice</i>	<i>awful</i>
<i>wonderful</i>	<i>horrible</i>
<i>excellent</i>	<i>poor</i>

STOP. DO NOT CONTINUE!

CEREAL

BAGELS

	CREAM CHEESE	
	CHOCOLATEY	
	FLAKES	
	SHMEARS	
	BOWL	
	ONIONS	
	MILK	
	BUTTER	
	SPOON	
	SESAME SEEDS	
	POTATO	
	CRUNCHY	
	SWEET	
	PUMPERNICKEL	
	PUFFS	
	KNIFE	

STOP. DO NOT CONTINUE!

Positive

Negative

	<i>favorable</i>	
	<i>worthless</i>	
	<i>pleasant</i>	
	<i>unacceptable</i>	
	<i>wonderful</i>	
	<i>bad</i>	
	<i>unpleasant</i>	
	<i>valuable</i>	
	<i>unfavorable</i>	
	<i>excellent</i>	
	<i>awful</i>	
	<i>good</i>	
	<i>horrible</i>	
	<i>acceptable</i>	
	<i>nice</i>	
	<i>poor</i>	

STOP. DO NOT CONTINUE!

CEREAL OR POSITIVE**BAGELS OR NEGATIVE**

	CRUNCHY	
	<i>valuable</i>	
	BUTTER	
	<i>unacceptable</i>	
	SESAME SEEDS	
	<i>favorable</i>	
	FLAKES	
	<i>worthless</i>	
	SHMEARS	
	<i>wonderful</i>	
	SPOON	
	<i>horrible</i>	
	PUMPERNICKEL	
	<i>pleasant</i>	
	SWEET	
	<i>unpleasant</i>	
	POTATO	
	<i>awful</i>	
	CHOCOLATEY	
	<i>excellent</i>	
	ONIONS	
	<i>acceptable</i>	
	BOWL	
	<i>nice</i>	
	CREAM CHEESE	
	<i>bad</i>	
	MILK	
	<i>unfavorable</i>	
	PUFFS	
	<i>good</i>	
	KNIFE	
	<i>poor</i>	

STOP. DO NOT CONTINUE!

CEREAL OR POSITIVE**BAGELS OR NEGATIVE**

	<i>unfavorable</i>	
	SHMEARS	
	<i>excellent</i>	
	MILK	
	<i>bad</i>	
	CHOCOLATEY	
	<i>wonderful</i>	
	BUTTER	
	<i>poor</i>	
	SPOON	
	<i>worthless</i>	
	BOWL	
	<i>horrible</i>	
	SESAME SEEDS	
	<i>pleasant</i>	
	CREAM CHEESE	
	<i>acceptable</i>	
	SWEET	
	<i>unpleasant</i>	
	FLAKES	
	<i>good</i>	
	ONIONS	
	<i>nice</i>	
	KNIFE	
	<i>favorable</i>	
	CRUNCHY	
	<i>unacceptable</i>	
	PUFFS	
	<i>awful</i>	
	PUMPERNICKEL	
	<i>valuable</i>	
	POTATO	

STOP. DO NOT CONTINUE!

BAGELS**CEREAL**

	SPOON	
	KNIFE	
	BOWL	
	ONIONS	
	MILK	
	CREAM CHEESE	
	PUFFS	
	PUMPERNICKEL	
	CHOCOLATEY	
	BUTTER	
	FLAKES	
	POTATO	
	CRUNCHY	
	SESAME SEEDS	
	SWEET	
	SHMEARS	

STOP. DO NOT CONTINUE!

BAGELS OR POSITIVE**CEREAL OR NEGATIVE**

	CHOCOLATEY	
	<i>Good</i>	
	POTATO	
	<i>Excellent</i>	
	BOWL	
	<i>horrible</i>	
	FLAKES	
	<i>valuable</i>	
	SHMEARS	
	<i>Poor</i>	
	PUFFS	
	<i>Nice</i>	
	CREAM CHEESE	
	<i>Unpleasant</i>	
	KNIFE	
	<i>Favorable</i>	
	MILK	
	<i>Acceptable</i>	
	ONIONS	
	<i>awful</i>	
	SPOON	
	<i>bad</i>	
	PUMPERNICKEL	
	<i>Wonderful</i>	
	BUTTER	
	<i>Unfavorable</i>	
	SWEET	
	<i>unacceptable</i>	
	SESAME SEEDS	
	<i>pleasant</i>	
	CRUNCHY	
	<i>Worthless</i>	

STOP. DO NOT CONTINUE!

BAGELS OR POSITIVE**CEREAL OR NEGATIVE**

	<i>awful</i>	
	CRUNCHY	
	<i>good</i>	
	MILK	
	<i>acceptable</i>	
	SESAME SEEDS	
	<i>unfavorable</i>	
	CHOCOLATEY	
	<i>valuable</i>	
	PUMPERNICKEL	
	<i>bad</i>	
	SPOON	
	<i>nice</i>	
	BUTTER	
	<i>unpleasant</i>	
	POTATO	
	<i>wonderful</i>	
	SHMEARS	
	<i>horrible</i>	
	PUFFS	
	<i>excellent</i>	
	KNIFE	
	<i>poor</i>	
	SWEET	
	<i>pleasant</i>	
	CREAM CHEESE	
	<i>favorable</i>	
	FLAKES	
	<i>unacceptable</i>	
	ONIONS	
	<i>worthless</i>	
	BOWL	

STOP. DO NOT CONTINUE!

Appendix F: Copy of the Main Research Questionnaire

ID Number:

Part A.

Please answer the following questions regarding the TV show 'Friends':

1. Please circle the number that best represents your overall attitude toward this TV show

I don't like it at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I like it a lot

2. How often do you watch this show?

☐ 0 - 5 times a month

☐ 11-20 times a month

☐ 6-10 times a month

☐ more than 20 times a month

3. Have you seen this particular episode before

☐ Yes

☐ No

4. On a personal level, this show is

Very Unimportant to me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Important to me

Very Irrelevant to me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Relevant to me

Means nothing to me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Means a lot to me

Very Unnecessary for me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very necessary for me

5. a) Please circle the number that best represents your overall attitude toward Joey

I don't like him at all **1** **2** **3** **4** **5** **6** **7** I like him a lot

b) Please circle the number that best represents your overall attitude toward Rachel

I don't like her at all **1** **2** **3** **4** **5** **6** **7** I like her a lot

c) Please circle the number that best represents your overall attitude toward Ross

I don't like him at all **1** **2** **3** **4** **5** **6** **7** I like him a lot

6a) Please circle the number indicating how similar Joey is to you as to his

Overall lifestyle:	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Very
	similar								similar
Cultural background:	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Very
	similar								similar
Dress & appearance:	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Very
	similar								similar
Basic Values:	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Very
	similar								similar

b) Please circle the number indicating how similar Rachel is to you as to her

Overall lifestyle:	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Very
	similar								similar
Cultural background:	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Very
	similar								similar
Dress & appearance:	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Very
	similar								similar
Basic Values:	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Very
	similar								similar

c) Please circle the number indicating how similar Ross is to you as to his

Overall lifestyle:	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Very
	similar								similar
Cultural background:	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Very
	similar								similar
Dress & appearance:	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Very
	similar								similar
Basic Values:	Not at all	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Very
	similar								similar

Part B:

ID Number:

Please list all the brands that come to mind for the following product categories

Pizza	Carbonated Beverage (Soda)
Breakfast Cereal	Beer

ID Number:

Part C

1. Please rate your attitudes to the following brands by marking the spot that is most relevant to your feelings.

COCA-COLA	PEPSI-COLA	RC COLA
Good _ _ _ _ _ Bad	Good _ _ _ _ _ Bad	Good _ _ _ _ _ Bad
Like _ _ _ _ _ Dislike	Like _ _ _ _ _ Dislike	Like _ _ _ _ _ Dislike
Pleasant _ _ _ _ _ Unpleasant	Pleasant _ _ _ _ _ Unpleasant	Pleasant _ _ _ _ _ Unpleasant
Buy _ _ _ _ _ Would not buy	Buy _ _ _ _ _ Would not buy	Buy _ _ _ _ _ Would not buy
Enjoyable _ _ _ _ _ Unenjoyable	Enjoyable _ _ _ _ _ Unenjoyable	Enjoyable _ _ _ _ _ Unenjoyable
CHEERIOS	COCOA PUFFS	LUCKY CHARMS
Good _ _ _ _ _ Bad	Good _ _ _ _ _ Bad	Good _ _ _ _ _ Bad
Like _ _ _ _ _ Dislike	Like _ _ _ _ _ Dislike	Like _ _ _ _ _ Dislike
Pleasant _ _ _ _ _ Unpleasant	Pleasant _ _ _ _ _ Unpleasant	Pleasant _ _ _ _ _ Unpleasant
Buy _ _ _ _ _ Would not buy	Buy _ _ _ _ _ Would not buy	Buy _ _ _ _ _ Would not buy
Enjoyable _ _ _ _ _ Unenjoyable	Enjoyable _ _ _ _ _ Unenjoyable	Enjoyable _ _ _ _ _ Unenjoyable

Part D

Your friend just got back from a two-week vacation in Europe and has invited you over to talk about the trip. Your friend has told you that he/she had emptied his/her fridge before going on the trip and has asked that you bring along some breakfast (he/she suggested milk, cereal, juice and yogurt) when you come by the next morning. Your friend does not have any brand preferences.

Please indicate how likely you are to pick up the following products.

Milk

Will not pick up at all **1** **2** **3** **4** **5** **6** **7** Will definitely pick up

Unless you marked “will not pick up all,” please choose the kind of milk you would pick by placing a mark next to the chosen kind.

Whole	<input type="checkbox"/>	1 %	<input type="checkbox"/>
2 %	<input type="checkbox"/>	Non-fat	<input type="checkbox"/>

Cereal

Will not pick up at all **1** **2** **3** **4** **5** **6** **7** Will definitely pick up

Unless you marked “will not pick up all,” please choose the brand of cereal you would pick by placing a mark next to the chosen brand.

Lucky Charms	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cheerios	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cocoa Puffs	<input type="checkbox"/>	Frosted Flakes	<input type="checkbox"/>

Juice

Will not pick up at all **1** **2** **3** **4** **5** **6** **7** Will definitely pick up

Unless you marked “will not pick up all,” please choose the brand of juice you would pick by placing a mark next to the chosen brand.

Minute Maid	<input type="checkbox"/>	Tropicana	<input type="checkbox"/>
Florida’s Natural	<input type="checkbox"/>	Sunny Delight	<input type="checkbox"/>

Yogurt

Will not pick up at all **1** **2** **3** **4** **5** **6** **7** Will definitely pick up

Unless you marked “will not pick up all,” please choose the brand of yogurt you would pick by placing a mark next to the chosen brand.

Dannon	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yoplait	<input type="checkbox"/>
Borden	<input type="checkbox"/>	Stonyfield	<input type="checkbox"/>

Part E

ID Number:

1. Write the number you were asked to remember _____

2. Please put a check-mark next to the brands that you have seen in today's episode.

<input type="checkbox"/> Coca-Cola	<input type="checkbox"/> Cocoa Puffs	<input type="checkbox"/> Sparkletts	<input type="checkbox"/> Quaker Oats
<input type="checkbox"/> Dell	<input type="checkbox"/> Tide	<input type="checkbox"/> Domino's	<input type="checkbox"/> KitKat
<input type="checkbox"/> Budweiser	<input type="checkbox"/> Cheerios	<input type="checkbox"/> Clorox	<input type="checkbox"/> Lysol

For every brand that you have checked above please answer the following questions.

Repeat your answer for every brand you have checked above

Put the name of the Brand here _____

- a) what, if anything, was said about the product _____
- b) what, if anything, was done with the product _____
- c) where was the product located _____
- d) what did the product look like _____
- e) what were you feeling when you saw the product _____

Put the name of the Brand here _____

- a) what, if anything, was said about the product _____
- b) what, if anything, was done with the product _____
- c) where was the product located _____

d) what did the product look like_____

e) what were you feeling when you saw the product_____

3. Please answer the following questions to the best of your memory and knowledge

What brand of pizza do characters in TV show “Friends” **usually** order? _____

What brand of beer do characters in TV show “Friends” **usually** drink? _____

4. Please check the appropriate box

☐ I am Female

☐ I am Male

5. I usually watch TV

☐ Less than 1 hour a day

☐ More than 2 but less than 3 hours a day

☐ More than 1 but less than 2 hours a day

☐ 3 and more hours a day

7. Please check this box if you participated in a very similar study watching

“Friends” and completing similar measures ☐

Appendix G: Debriefing Procedure and Debriefing Note

After completion of the questionnaire the researcher debriefed participants about the real purpose of the experiment.

Below is the text of the debriefing note that was read to participants.

“Thank you very much for participation in this experiment. Now when the experiment is over, I am going to tell you about the research you participated in. The overall purpose of this experiment is to investigate brand placement – marketing communication technique that is becoming very popular nowadays. Product placement is a paid product message aimed at influencing movie (or television) audiences via the planned and unobtrusive entry of a branded product into a movie or television program.

The specific purpose of this experiment was to assess the effects of both prominence of brand placements in TV shows and persuasion knowledge of the audience on viewers’ recall, recognition, attitudes and intentions. Researchers manipulated persuasion knowledge and type of brand placement occurrences in TV show episode that you have just seen. Participants in some groups saw TV show episode with prominently placed brands, while others the same brand placed subtly.

Also participants in some groups were given the short statements about the practice of brand placement to read before they watch the episode and answer the questions. That’s how we manipulated the participants’ initial knowledge of persuasion. The questions that you were asked to answer are all geared to evaluate your recall and recognition of the brand placed in the movie, and effect of that on your attitude and intentions towards the brand. In order to maintain study’s integrity and because we are still running experiments in the other groups, I would like to ask you not to discuss this study with anyone in UT, until the study is over on _____(DATE!).

Please feel free to ask me any questions regarding this research.

Thank you very much – your participation was really important for this research! “

References

- Aaker, D.A., Batra, R. & Myers J. G., (1992), *Advertising Management* (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice- Hall.
- Ahluwalia, R. (2000), "Examination of psychological processes underlying resistance to persuasion," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27, 217- 232.
- Alba J. & Chattopadhyay A. (1986), "Salience effects in brand recall," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 23(4), 363-369.
- Anand, P., & Sternthal B. (1990), "Ease of message processing as a moderator of repetition effects in advertising," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 27, 345-353.
- Andrews J. C. (1989), "The dimensionality of beliefs towards advertising in general," *Journal of Advertising*, 18(1), 26-35.
- Arias-Bolzmann L., Chakraborty G., & Mowen J.C. (2000), "Effects of absurdity in advertising: The moderating role of product category attitude and the mediating role of cognitive responses," *Journal of Advertising*, XXIX (1), 35-49.
- Armstrong M. (2001), " 'Law and Order' getting virtual ads," [www.eonline.com/news/Items/Pf/0,1527,8317,00.html] (Retrieved 20 January, 2004)
- Auty, S. & Lewis C. (2004), "Exploring children's choice: The reminder effect of product placement," *Psychology & Marketing*, 21 (9), 697-713.
- Avery R. J. & Ferraro R. (2000), "Verisimilitude or advertising, brand appearances on prime-time television," *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 34 (2), 217 – 245.
- Babin, L.A. & Carder S. T. (1996 a), "Advertising via the box office: Is product placement effective?" *Journal of Promotion Management*, 3(1/2), 31-51.
- Babin, L.A., & Carder S. T. (1996 b), "Viewers' recognition of brands placed within a film," *International Journal of Advertising*, 15(2), 140-151.
- Baker, M. J., & Crawford H. A. (1995), "Product Placement", unpublished working paper, University of Strachclyde, Glasgow.

- Bagozzi R. P, Guham-Canli Z., & Priester J. (2002), "*The Social Psychology of Consumer Behavior*", Open University Press, Buckingham, Philadelphia.
- Balasubramanian S. (1994), "Beyond advertising and publicity: Hybrid messages and public policy issues," *Journal of Advertising* 23(Fall), 29-46.
- Banaji, M. R. & Hardin C. D. (1996), "Automated stereotyping," *Psychological Science*, 7(3), 136-141
- Bargh, J. A. (2002), "Losing consciousness: Automatic influences on consumer judgment, behavior, and motivation," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29, 280-285.
- Barry, J.F., & Sargeant E.W. (1927), *Building Theatre Patronage: Management and Merchandising*. New York: Chalmers
- Bauder D. (1999), "Digital products placed on TV," *ABC News* [<http://ABCnews.go.com/sections/tech/dailynews/digitalads990330.html>] (Retrieved 25 January, 2004)
- Bergman, C. (1989), "Tobacco's cloudy image on the silver screen," *Christian Science Monitor*, July 28, 19.
- Belch, G. E. & Belch M. A. (1995), *Introduction to Advertising and Promotion: An Integrated Marketing Communications Perspective*, 3rd Edition, Richard D. Irwin Inc., Chicago.
- Bodenhausen, G., & Macrae, N. (1998), "Stereotype activation and inhibition," In R. S. Wyer, Jr. (Ed.), *Advances in Social Cognition* (Vol. 11, pp. 1-52).Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bornstein, R. F. (1989), "Exposure and affect: Overview and meta-analysis of research, 1968–1987," *Psychological Bulletin*, 106, 265-289.
- Bornstein, R. F. & D'Agostino P. R. (1992), "Stimulus recognition and the mere exposure effect," *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 63 (4), 545-552.
- Brennan, J. (2001), "Movie magic is elusive," *Advertising Age*, April 04, 72(15).
- Brennan, I., Dubas K.M., & Babin L (1999), "The influence of product placement type and exposure time on product placement recognition," *International Journal of Advertising* 18, 323-337.
- Brunel F. F., Tietjev B. C. & Greenwald A.G. (2004), "Is the implicit association test a valid measure of implicit consumer social cognition," *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 14(4), 385-404.

- Buss D. D. (1998), "Making your mark in movies and TV," *Nation's Business* 86 (12), 28-34.
- Campbell, M. C. & Kirmani A. (2000), "Consumers' use of persuasion knowledge: The effects of accessibility and cognitive capacity on perceptions of an influence agent," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 27, June.
- Caro, M. (1996), "Of all the Jim Beam joints..." *Chicago Tribune*, August 20, C1
- Chaiken S. (1980), "Heuristic vs. systematic information processing and the use of source vs. message cues in persuasion," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 752-766.
- Chaiken, S., & Trope Y. (1999), *Dual-process theories in social psychology*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Chaney I. M., Lin K., & Chaney J. (2005), "The effect of billboards within the gaming environment," *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 5(1).
- Comstock G, S. Chaffee, N. Katzman, M. McCombs and D. Roberts (1978), *Television and Human behavior*, New York: Columbia University Press
- Croft, L. (2001), "And the brand played on," *The Guardian*, June 30.
- Curtis, J. (1996), "Taking pride of place" *Marketing*, November 28, 55.
- d'Astous A. & Chartier F. (1999), "How should we plug our brand? A study of factors affecting consumer evaluating and memory of product placements in movies," In Y. Evrard, W.D. Hoyer, and A. Strazzieri (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Third International Research Seminar on Marketing Communications and Consumer Behavior*, IAE d'Aix-en-Providence, 104 – 117.
- d'Astous, A., & Chartie F.(2000), "A study of factors affecting consumer evaluations and memory of product placement in movies," *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, 22, 31-40.
- DeLorme, D. & Reid L. (1997), "Moviegoers experiences and interpretation of brands revisited," Paper presented at 1997 Conference of American Academy of Advertising, St Louis.
- DeLorme, D. & Reid L. (1999), "Moviegoers' experiences and interpretations of brands in films revisited", *Journal of Advertising*, 28 (Summer), 71-95.
- DeLorme, D., Reid L. & Zimmer M. (1994), "Brands in films: young moviegoers' experiences and interpretations", *Proceedings of American Academy of Advertising*.

Dasgupta, N., McGhee D. E., Greenwald A. G., & Banaji M.R. (2000), "Automatic preference for white Americans: Eliminating the familiarity explanation," *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 36, 316-328.

Dortch S. (1996), "Going to the movies," *American Demographics*, 18 (December), 22-23.

Dovidio, J. F., & Fazio R. H. (1991), "New technologies for the direct and indirect assessment of attitudes," In J. M. Tanur (Ed.), *Questions about Questions: Inquiries into the Cognitive Bases of Surveys*, New York: Russell Sage, 204-237.

Downey, K. (2002), "It's diminishing the value of television advertising," *Media Life Journal*, February 15.

Ebenkamp, B. (2001), "Return to Peyton placement," *Brandweek*, 42 (April 06), S10.

Elliot, S. (1997), "Lawsuit shows risks of product placement," *The New York Times*, (February 7), C2.

Entertainment Resources and Marketing Association (ERMA) website, [<http://www.emainc.org/web/>], (Retrieved 30 January, 2005).

Fazio, R. H. (1990), "Multiple processes by which attitudes guide behavior: The MODE Model as an integrative framework," *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 23, 75-109.

Fazio, R.H., Sanbonmatsu D. M., Powell M.C., & Kardes F.R., (1986), "On the automatic activation of attitudes," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50(2), 229-238.

Fazio, R. H., & Towles-Schwen T. (1999), "The MODE Model of attitude-behavior processes," In S. Chaiken & Y. Trope (Eds.), *Dual-Process Theories in Social Psychology*, New York: Guilford.

Ferraro, R. & Avery R.J. (2000), "Brand appearances on prime-time television," *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, 22 (2).

Freeman, L. (1991), "As panorama of choice unfolds, buyers' nerves fray," *Advertising Age*, 62 (52), December 9, 32.

Friestad, M. & Wright P. (1994), "The Persuasion Knowledge Model: How people cope with persuasion attempts," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21 (June), 1-31.

Friedman, M. (1986), "Commercial influences in the lyrics of popular American music of the postwar era," *Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 20(2), 93.

Friedman, W. (2005), "With paid product placement on the rise, music industry confronts payola," *Media Daily News*, July 26.
http://publications.mediapost.com/index.cfm?fuseaction=Articles.showArticleHomePage&art_aid=32433 [Retrieved online December 19, 2005]

Goetzl, D. (2001), "TBS tries virtual advertising," *Advertising Age*, 72 (21), 8.

Gogoi, P., & Sager I. (2003), "The ad game's new game," *Business Week* 3839, June 30, 12.

Gordon K. (2003), "Ads: The money shots," *Psychology Today*, Nov-Dec.

Gould S., Gupta P., & Grabner-Krauter S. (2000), "Product placement in movies: A cross-cultural analysis of Austrian, French and American consumers' attitudes towards this emerging international promotional medium," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 30(4), 41-58.

Greenwald, A., McGhee D. E., & Schwartz J. L. K. (1998), "Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The Implicit Association Test," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 1464 -1480.

Greenwald, A. & Clark L. (1984), "Audience involvement in advertising: Four levels," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 11 (June), 581-592.

Grimm, M. (2001), "Reality bites," *American Demographics*, (July).

Grigorovici D., & Constantin C. (2004), "Experiencing interactive Advertising beyond rich media: Impacts of ad type and presence on brand effectiveness in 3D gaming immersive virtual environments," *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 5(1).

Gupta, P., & Gould S. (1997), "Consumers' perceptions of the ethics and acceptability of product placements in movies: Product category and individual differences," *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, 19(1), 37 –50.

Gupta, P., & Lord K. (1998), "Product placement in movies: The effect of prominence and mode on audience recall," *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, 20, 47-59.

Gupta P., Balasubramanian S. & Klassen M.(2000), "Viewers' evaluations of product placements in movies: Public policy issues and managerial implications", *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, 22 (Fall), 41-52.

Haas, R. G. & Grady K. (1975), "Temporal delay, type of forewarning, and resistance to influence," *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 11 (September), 459-469.

Hank C. & Kim (2003), "IAG to measure brand integration," *Advertising Age*, 74 (43), October 27, 3.

Hawkins, S. A., & Hoch S. J. (1992), "Low-Involvement learning: Memory without evaluation," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 19, 21-225.

Hoffner C., & Cantor J. (1991), "Perceiving and Responding to Mass Media Characters," In J. Bryant & D. Zillmann (Eds.), *Responding to the Screen*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Holden S. J. & Vanhuele M. (1999), "Know the name, forget the exposure: Brand familiarity versus memory of exposure context," *Psychology and Marketing*, (16), 479-496.

Horovitz, B. (2000), "Believe your eyes? Ads bend reality. Digital images appear real to TV viewers," *USA Today*, (April 24).

Hoyer, W. D. & MacInnis D. J. (2001), *Consumer Behavior*, 2nd ed. Houghton Mifflin Company.

Intermedia Advertising Group homepage, http://www.iagr.net/sln_iaginprogram.jsp (Retrieved 3 January, 2006)

J. Walter Thompson USA (1989), *Product as Props in Movies and Television* (June).

Janiszewski, C. (1993), "Preattentive mere exposure effects," *Journal of Consumer Research*, (20) 376 -392.

Johnson M. K, Foley M.A., Suengas A.G., Raye C.L. (1988), "Phenomenological characteristics of memories for perceived and imagined autobiographical events," *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 117, 371-376

Karrh, J. A. (1994), "Effects of brand placements in motion pictures," In K. W. King (Ed.), *The proceedings of the 1994 conference of the American Academy of Advertising* (90-96). Athens, GA: Henry W. Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication.

Karrh, J. A. (1995a), "Informing audience about brand placements: Effects on memory and attributions," paper presented to the 1995 Public Policy and Marketing Conference.

Karrh, J. A. (1995b), "Brand placements in feature films: The practitioners' view," In proceedings of the 1995 American Academy of Advertising Conference, Karen W. King, ed. Athens, GA: American Academy of Advertising.

- Karrh, J. A. (1998a), "Brand placement: A Review," *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, 20, 31-49.
- Karrh, J. A. (1998b), "Why (some) brand placements are effective: Insights from impression management research," In D. D. Muehling (Ed.), *The proceedings of the 1998 conference of the American Academy of Advertising* (pp. 306-307). Pullman, WA: Washington State University.
- Karrh, J. A, McKee K. B. & Pardun C. J. (2003), Practitioners' evolving views on product placement effectiveness," *Journal of Advertising Research*, June, 138 – 149.
- Kim, J.Y. (2003), "Communication message strategies for brand extensions," *Journal of Product & Brand Management* 12(7), 462-477.
- Kotler, P. (1991), *Marketing Management: Analysis, Planning, Implementation, and Control* (7th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Krishnan S. H., & Trappey C. V. (1999), "Non-Conscious memory processes in marketing: A historical perspective and future directions," *Psychology and Marketing*, 16(6) 451 – 457.
- Krugman, H. E. (1965), "The impact of television advertising: Learning without involvement," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 29 (Fall), 349-356.
- Lackey W. B. (1993), "Can Lois Lane smoke Marlboros? An examination of the constitutionality of regulating product placement in movies," *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 275 – 292.
- Lareau, J., (2005), "Toyota on lookout for print-placement deals," *Advertising Age* August 1, 76 (31), 25.
- Law S. & Braun K. (2000), "I'll have what she is having: Gauging the impact of product placement on viewers," *Psychology & Marketing* 17 (December), 1059-1075.
- Leigh J. H. & Manon S. (1987)," Audience involvement on the information processing of umbrella print advertisements," *Journal of Advertising*, 16 (3), 3-12
- "Let us put you in the movies" (1996), *Brandweek*, 37(September 16).
- Lord, K.R., & Burnkrant R. E. (1993), "Attention versus distraction: The interactive effect of program involvement and attentional devices on commercial processing," *Journal of Advertising*, 22(1), 47-60.
- Loro, L. (1990), "Philly products angle for ringside in Rocky 5," *Advertising Age*, 61 (February 5), 20.

- Lowery, B. S., Hardin, C. D., & Sinclair, S. (2001). "Social influence effects on automatic racial prejudice," *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 81(5), 842-855.
- Lynch, J. G. & Srull T. K. (1982), "Memory and attentional factors in consumer choice: Concepts and research methods," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 9 (June), 18-37.
- MacLachlan, J., Czepiel J. & LaBarbera P. (1979), "Implementation of response latency measures," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 16, 573-577
- Maheswaran D. & Chaiken S. (1991), "Promoting systematic processing in low-motivation settings: Effect of incongruent information on processing and judgment," *Journal of Persuasion and Social Psychology*, 61, 13-33.
- McClellan, S. (2003), "Ad clutter keeps climbing," *Broadcasting and Cable*, (December 22).
- McKee K. B. (1998). "Conceptualizing brand placement as a viable media strategy: Perspectives and prescriptives," In D. D. Muehling (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 1998 Conference of the American Academy of Advertising* (307-308). Pullman, WA: American Academy of Advertising
- McKechie S. A. & Zhou J. (2003), "Product placement in movies: A comparison of Chinese and American consumers' attitudes," *International Journal of Advertising*, 22, 349-374.
- Mintel Reports (2005) "Breakfast cereals in US", available from www.Mintel.com, April 2005.
- Mintel Reports (2004) "Breakfast Foods in US", available from www.Mintel.com, October 2005.
- Moreland R. L., & Zajonc R. B. (1977), "Is stimulus recognition a necessary condition for the occurrence of exposure effects?" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35, 191-199.
- Morton, C. R. & Friedman M. (2002), "I saw it in the movies: Exploring the link between product placement beliefs and reported usage behavior," *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, 224(2).
- Mortimer, R. (2002), "Box office brand bonanzas," *Brand Strategy*, (December).
- Mowen, J.C. (1993), *Consumer Behavior* (3rd ed.), New York: Macmillan.
- Murdock G. (1992), "Branded images," *Sight and Sound*, 18, (July), 18-19.

National Broadcasting Company (2004), NBC.com Friends. *NBC.com*
<http://www.nbc.com/friends/> [Retrieved on 20 March, 2004.

Nebenzahl, I. D., & Secunda E. (1993), "Consumers' attitudes towards product placements in movies," *International Journal of Advertising*, 12, 1-11.

Nedungadi, A. (1990), "Ad affect, brand attitude, and choice: The moderating roles of delay and involvement," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 17 (1).

Nelson, M. (2002), "Recall of brand placements in computer video games," *Journal of Advertising Research*, (April) 80-91.

Nelson M. R., Keum H., & Yaros R.A. (2004), "Advertainment or adcreep? Game players' attitudes toward advertising and product placements in computer games," *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 5(1).

Nelson B. & Steinberg E. (2003), "Unit of WPP will own stake in ABC shows", *The Wall Street Journal*, December 1.

"New sophistication for product pitching in pix" (1979) *Variety*, August 29, 1.

Newell, J. & Salmon C. T. (2003), "From Lumiere to E.T.: A history of product placement," Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Kansas City.

Nozar, R. A (2001), "Product placements help heighten brand exposure," *Hotel and Motel Management*, 216 (9), 3-5.

Park, C. W. & McClung G. W. (1986), "The effect of TV program involvement on involvement with commercials," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 13(1), 544-548

Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo J. T. (1984), "Source factors and the Elaboration Likelihood Model," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 11 (1), 668-672.

Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo J.T.(1986), "The Elaboration Likelihood Model of persuasion," In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 19, 123-205, New York: Academic.

Petty R. E., Cacioppo J.T. & Schumann D. (1983), "Central and peripheral routes to advertising effectiveness: The moderating role of involvement," *Journal of Consumer Research*, (September) 135-146.

Petty, R. E., & Wegener, D. T. (1999). "The elaboration likelihood model: Current Status and controversies," In S. Chaiken, & Y. Trope (Eds.), *Dual-Process Theories in Social Psychology* (pp. 41-72). New York: Guilford.

Princeton Video Image Inc homepage, [<http://www.pvi.tv/pvi/index.html>] (Retrieved: 15 January, 2004).

Product Placement Beyond TV (2005), *Maclean's*, 118 (8), February 21.

Puth, G., Mostert P., & Ewing M. (1999), "Consumer perceptions of mentioned product and brand attributes in magazine advertising," *Journal of Product and Brand Management* 8(1), 38-49.

Pursell, C. (2000), "Gabbers getting talked out," *Variety*, 377, 7.

Quester P. & Farrelly F. (1998), "Brand associations and memory decay effects of sponsorship, the case of the Australian formula one grand prix," *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 7(6) 543- 556.

Research Alert (2002), "Adults watch TV news, teens prefer sitcoms," *EPM Communications, Research Alert* 20 (8), April 19.

Rosen, D. M. (1990), "Big time plugs on small-company budgets," *Sales and Marketing Management*, (December), 48-55.

Rossler P. & Bacher J. (2001), "Transcultural effects of product placement in movies. A comparison of placement impact in Germany and the USA," Paper presented at the 51st Annual Conference of the International Communication Association, Washington DC May, 2001.

Rudman, L. A., Greenwald A. G., Mellot D. S., & Schwartz, J. L. K. (1999), "Measuring the automatic components of prejudice: Flexibility and generality of the Implicit Association Test," *Social Cognition*, 17, 437-465.

Russell, C. (1998), "Toward a framework of product placement: Theoretical propositions," *Advances in Consumer Research*, 25, 357-362.

Russell, C. (2002), "Investigating the effectiveness of product placements in television Shows: The role of modality and plot connection on brand memory and attitude," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 29(3), 306-318.

Ryan, L. (2003), "WB offers ad plugs in series," *Television week*, 22(13), 1-2.

Sapolsky & Kinney (1994), "You oughta be in pictures: Product placements in the top

grossing films of 1991”, paper presented on the 1994 conference of American Academy of Advertising, Athens GA.

Schiller G. (2004a), “Giants, startups of placement valuation,” *Hollywood Reporter Online*, December 30, [http://209.11.49.186/thr/marketing/brief_display.jsp?vnu_content_id=1000743496] (Retrieved 01 January 2006)

Schiller G. (2004b), “Golden rule hard measure to find,” *Hollywood Reporter Online*, December 30, [http://www.hollywoodreporter.com/thr/article_display.jsp?vnu_content_id=1000743495] (Retrieved 04 January 2006)

Schneider L. P.& Cornwell T.B. (2005), “Cashing in on crashes via brand placement in computer games: The effects of experience and flow on memory,” *International Journal of Advertising*, 24(3), pp. 321–343

Schneider M., & Adalian J. (2003), “Peacock, eye share in season's ratings wealth,” *Daily Variety*, 279, 34.

Seger, C. A. (1994) “Implicit learning,” *Psychological Bulletin*, 115(2), 163 – 196.

Shapiro, S., MacInnis D. J., Heckler S. E., Perez A. M. (1999), “An experimental method for studying unconscious perception in a marketing context,” *Psychology and Marketing*, 16 (6), 459 – 477.

Shapiro S., MacInnis D. J., Heckler S. E. (1997), “The effects of incidental ad exposure on the formation of consideration sets,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, 24, 94-104.

Sharkey B. (1988), “How many noticed Sanka in Dundee II?” CinemaScore polls moviegoers,” *Adweek's Marketing Week* (June 20), 33-34.

Simmons Market Research Bureau Inc (1991) *Study of Media ad Markets*, P-7, 10. New York.

Snyder, S. L. (1992), “Movies and product placement: Is Hollywood tuning films into commercial speech?” *University of Illinois Law Review*, 1, 301 – 337.

Sreenivasan S. (1997), “What is a hit film? Moviefone May Know”, *The New York Times*, June2, D9

Steinberg B. & Vranica S. (2003a), “Five key issues could alter the ad industry,” *Wall Street Journal*, B1, (January 5).

Steinberg, B. & Vranica S. (2003b), “Prime-Time TV's new guest stars: Products,” *Wall Street Journal*, B1, (January 12).

Stratton, D. C. (1992), "Product placement in motion pictures: Measuring its impact as an advertising medium," Master Thesis, University of Texas at Austin.

Ten most-recalled product placement in reality shows (2004), *Advertising Age*, December 12, 75 (51), 26.

Tulving, E., & Schacter D. L. (1990), "Priming and human memory systems," *Science*, 247, 301–306.

Turcotte (1995), "*Gimme a Bud! The Feature Film Product Placement Industry*," unpublished manuscript, University of Texas at Austin.

Valenti, C. (2001), "As seen on TV," [[http:// abcnews.go.com/sections/ business/DailyNews/product_placement_011115.html](http://abcnews.go.com/sections/business/DailyNews/product_placement_011115.html)], (Retrieved 05 January, 2004).

Vollmers, S. M., & Mizerski R. W. (1994), "A Review and investigation into the effectiveness of product placements in films," In K. W. King (Ed.), *The proceedings of the 1994 conference of the American Academy of Advertising* (97-102). Athens, GA: Henry W. Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication.

Vollmers, S.M. (1995), *The impact on children of brands and product placements in films*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL.

Van Biema, D. (1982), "Life is sweet for lack Dowd as Spielberg's hit film has E.T lovers picking up the (Reese's) Pieces," *People*, (July, 7) 27.

Wagner, C. B (2001), "Implicit attitudes and anti-drug PSAs: Automatic processes and unreasoned action," Paper presented at the 84th annual conference of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Washington, DC.

Wagner, C. B, & Sundar S. S. (2003), "Automatic activation of drug attitudes: Anti-drug ad viewing styles and Strength of Association," Top Faculty Paper presented to the Communication Theory and Methodology Division at the 86th annual conference of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, (July 2003), Kansas City, MO.

Whittler T. E., & DiMeo J. (1991), "Viewers' reactions to racial cues in advertising stimuli," *Journal of Advertising Research*, 31(6), 37-46.

Williams, P., Fitzsimons G. J. & Block L. G. (2004), "When consumers don't recognize 'benign' intentions questions as persuasive attempts," *Journal of Consumer Research*, 31 (December), 540-551.

York A. (2001), "The product placement monster that E.T. spawned," Salon, April 26, Available online [http://www.salon.com/tech/feature/2001/04/26/product_placement/], Retrieved 20 March 2006

Zajonc R. B. (1968), "Attitudinal effects of mere exposure," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 9, 1-27.

Vita

Anna V. Andriasova was born in Baku, Azerbaijan on November 6, 1975, the daughter of Maisa A. Popova and Valerii A. Andriasov. She went to high school in Yerevan, Armenia and then entered the Yerevan State University's Department of International Economics, where she obtained her Bachelor's degree. She followed that up with an MBA from the American University of Armenia, while working as the marketing manager for a local carpet manufacturing organization. After completing her MBA, Anna was asked by the Center for Business Research and Development at the American University of Armenia to stay on as a Research Associate, which she did for a year. In September 2000, she entered the Graduate School of The University of Texas at Austin, College of Communications. In the Summer of 2004, she taught various marketing courses as a Visiting Instructor in the graduate program at the American University of Armenia. She has published a case study and co-authored several papers in the field of advertising.

Permanent address: 2000 N. Adams Street, apartment 605, Arlington, Virginia, 22201

This dissertation was typed by the author.